

**McClellan AFB Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)**  
**Meeting Transcript**  
**January 20, 1999**

**Members attending:** Paul Brunner, DoD Co-Chair; Charles Yarbrough Sr., Community Co-Chair; Del Callaway; Mannard Gaines; Sheila Guerra; Erwin Hayer; Joe Healy, U.S. EPA; Alex MacDonald, RWQCB; Linda Piercy; Bill Shepherd

**Members not attending:** Barry Bertrand; Bill Gibson; Tovey Giezentanner, Rep. Doug Ose's Office; Simeon Okoroike; Anthony Piercy; Cuddy Tubbs, Rep. Matsui's Office; Imogene Zander

**Others attending:** Michael Acton, Acton Mickelson Environmental, Inc.; Elaine Anderegg, McClellan AFB; G. Blanth, Community Member; Merianne Briggs, McClellan AFB; Gary Collier, Parker Homes Neighborhood Association; Michele Dermer, Bechtel Environmental, Inc; Paul Devereaux, SAFCA; D. Fischman; Steve Kalvelage, Sacramento County Environmental Management Department; Grant Kreinberg, SAFCA; Frank Miller, Community Member; Phil Mook, McClellan AFB; Chris Quackenbush; Jeff Raines, TechLaw; Rick Solander, McClellan AFB; Pam Wee, Kleinfelder; Roxanne Yonn, Radian

TRANSCRIPT:

**Introduction, Welcome, and Announcements**

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Just counting — by the way, it took a little time to check to see if we had enough members here tonight to actually accept some members onto the RAB. And here comes another one, so that definitely makes it so. I was doing a little counting to make sure we had a quorum here tonight to accept some new members and do any other kind of new business we wanted to.

Mr. Paul Brunner: And we do.

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And we do so we can go on. I'd like to welcome everyone to tonight's Restoration Advisory Board meeting. And I hope you pick up some information to take home with you. Plus, we can show you what the cleanup program is like here at McClellan; how it's coming.

1 I would like at this time to have the Restoration Advisory Board members introduce themselves  
2 to the audience. And I will start over here on my right with Linda Piercy. Do you mind  
3 introducing yourself?

4  
5 Ms. Linda Piercy: My name is Linda Piercy. I'm a community member.

6  
7 Mr. Del Callaway: Del Callaway, chair of Reuse and Relative Risk Ranking.

8  
9 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Sheila Guerra, Community Relations chairperson.

10  
11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Chuck Yarbrough, Community co-chair.

12  
13 Mr. Paul Brunner: I'm Paul Brunner, the DoD RAB co-chair.

14  
15 Mr. Bill Sheppard: I'm Bill Sheppard. I'm a community member.

16  
17 Mr. Joe Healy: Joe Healy, with the U.S. EPA.

18  
19 Mr. Alex MacDonald: I'm Alex MacDonald. I'm with the Regional Water Quality  
20 Control Board.

21  
22 Mr. Mannard Gaines: Mannard Gaines, community member.

23  
24 **Purpose of the RAB and Ground Rules**

25  
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, I'd like you to look at the RAB ground rules tonight and  
27 make sure that you follow them. If, particularly the people in the audience, you can please state  
28

1 your name for the record. So we'll go ahead and start the meeting. Make sure when you make a  
2 statement that you say it loud and clear. And please approach the microphone so we can make  
3 sure that we get you in the minutes and get an answer to your questions. We do have a number of  
4 public comment periods as you can see in the minutes.

5  
6 During our meeting we will announce when you can make public comments. If you want to  
7 during a particular topic, if it's on that particular item, you can raise your hand and approach the  
8 Board upon recognition.

9  
10 Do we have any questions from the Board at this time?

11  
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: Chuck, as we launch into the minutes — like I've done at the last several  
13 meetings, I just like to read this one statement that we have...

14  
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay.

16  
17 Mr. Paul Brunner: ...for the DoD for where we're coming from. This is for people to  
18 understand from where McClellan is coming from in regards to the Restoration Advisory Board.  
19 The statement says, "McClellan Air Force Base is here tonight because our past industrial  
20 operations and disposal actions created pollution. We regret and apologize for those actions.  
21 Although no one here in this room tonight is directly responsible for the contamination caused in  
22 the past, we're responsible for fixing it. We know we have a problem and we're doing our best to  
23 solve it. We want your opinions and your advice. That is why we are here." Thanks, Chuck.

24  
25 **Approval of October 21 and December 2, 1998 Meeting Minutes**

26  
27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. Now we'll move along to our minutes from the last meeting.

1 Actually, we have two meetings here. Approval of the October 21<sup>st</sup> and December 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting  
2 minutes. Do I have a motion that we accept the minutes as written?

3  
4 Mr. Del Callaway: Are they in final?

5  
6 Mr. Sheila Guerra: They're verbatim.

7  
8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: They're verbatim minutes.

9  
10 Mr. Sheila Guerra: They're verbatim.

11  
12 Mr. Del Callaway: I'll make a motion to accept the minutes as written.

13  
14 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. Do I have a second?

15  
16 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I'll second.

17  
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Then all in favor of accepting the October 21<sup>st</sup> and December 2<sup>nd</sup>  
19 meetings, do so by raising your right hand, please. Okay. Unanimous vote. Now.... Yes?

20  
21 Mr. Paul Brunner: I have a question on the minutes. I know potentially we'll talk more about  
22 the minutes, Sheila, on your agenda item. But while we're approving these minutes here, there  
23 was an action that we had from the group a couple of meetings ago that we have not placed our  
24 minutes, these last versions, on the Web page that we have. As they're being approved, I would  
25 like to be able to take what we've done at the last meetings and put it on the Web. Or should we  
26 do that discussion during your time, Sheila?

1 Ms. Sheila Guerra: On the verbatim?

2  
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: On the verbatim. These are records of what we have for the last several  
4 meetings.

5  
6 Ms. Sheila Guerra: There wasn't any decision made, is that correct?

7  
8 Mr. Del Callaway: No, we discussed that we were not going to do that. But we didn't come to  
9 a final decision on it and we also discussed that we're going to change and not do the verbatim.  
10 But we have not made a final decision on that, either.

11  
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: I asked my question from the point of view in that I was asked by —  
13 maybe not by you Del, but from one of the members, "Why weren't our minutes on the Web  
14 page for the last three?" And was it because the group asked us not to? Because we'd gone to the  
15 verbatim. But they're still minutes from the last three meetings and since this is what we produce  
16 and this is what we...

17  
18 Ms. Sheila Guerra: So are you asking us if it's all right to put them on the Web?

19  
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: I was looking for your advice on that. I personally think that they should  
21 go on the minutes — it's just what we've done in the last three.

22  
23 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Well, if they've been approved, I don't have any objection on that.

24  
25 Mr. Del Callaway: I would address that it would take up too much room on the Web page to  
26 put all of that on there. The important items should be gleaned from it and put on and reference  
27 made to that it's available, if someone would want to look at it or read it.

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: I actually would object to that aspect of it, Del. On that the text that is on  
2 the page, we take a long time in minutes to talk about the discussions. So before we went to these  
3 — it just reflects what we've done the last three meetings. I would rather not spend a lot of time  
4 trying to edit or change what we went through so far. Just take it, accept it, when we talk about it  
5 later, we modify it. But it is a recording of what we did for the last meetings. It's what we work  
6 towards having.

7  
8 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Do you have copies of those in the Repository now?

9  
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: Most likely we do. I just know on our Web page we have listed that copies  
11 of our minutes are there.

12  
13 Ms. Merianne Briggs: There is a copy in the Repository at Environmental Management.

14  
15 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, if there is no other opinion on that, then I'll work with that as to  
16 what we talked about around the table — and see what the space is and that — like your  
17 comment was Del. But my sense is it should fit.

18  
19 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, there was on the first one a lot of oo's and ah's and oh's and coughs  
20 and sneezes. I don't think anybody is interested in reading all that. I don't think it would take  
21 away from the minutes to leave it out.

22  
23 Mr. Paul Brunner: We agreed that we would take out the editorial comments, which we've  
24 done.

25  
26 Mr. Del Callaway: And glean the fruit of the matter and put it on the Web site. Then if anyone  
27 wanted to read the rest of it, it's in the Repository they can read it. You are not hiding anything.

1 It's just saving space, because you're talking about probably — I don't know how many bytes of  
2 information that it would use up.

3  
4 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, the problem that I have, well that's true, but then someone would  
5 have to edit what was said that was important — and that just takes more time from our energy.  
6 And I'm not sure if it's really worth the effort to go through that.

7  
8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, if they got the room and they want to put it on there, let them  
9 put it on.

10  
11 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay.

12  
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So current Air Force News, is that you?

14  
15 **Current Air Force News**

16  
17 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes. A couple of things that I wanted to make mention of. And since the  
18 2<sup>nd</sup> of December, we did not have any press releases that came out. This part of the agenda is to  
19 aim at something new that's come out, to let people know up front what is happening.

20  
21 We didn't have any press releases. The last time we did go through a press release, we had three  
22 or four that came out that we reported on during that time. We had some discussion. I thought it  
23 would be worthwhile to spend a second here to let you know on three of the releases what did  
24 take place up front here. One was on the soil vapor extraction system and the Groundwater  
25 Treatment Plant — tied together where we had glitches in our system that were operating.

26 Elaine?

1 Ms. Elaine Andereg: Phil will answer.

2  
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Oh, Phil? I know Phil gave a report at the Technical Report Committee,  
4 real quick, as to what did take place in those actions where we have the incident occur. But, Phil,  
5 if you would address those.

6  
7 Mr. Phil Mook: Well, we had a couple of releases at our treatment facility, like Paul  
8 mentioned. This pointed out that what we thought was failsafes, our mechanical and electronic  
9 failsafes that would shut down the system prior to any release of untreated water, media, or air,  
10 were not working. So what we've done is we took down all the systems — shut down all the  
11 systems and ran through the failsafes to make sure that they were operating properly. We made  
12 several fixes on the spot to failsafes.

13  
14 We also took an engineering analysis to see if the existing failsafes were adequate. And several  
15 recommendations for either redundant systems or enhanced systems were made. And we're in the  
16 process of doing those.

17  
18 We also reduced our response times and have people on site over the weekend. So if something  
19 happens on a day where we would not normally have staffing there, there would be somebody  
20 checking the systems. So if we did have abnormal operations it would get shut down as quickly  
21 as possible.

22  
23 So we've taken a number of measures, both engineering measures and personnel measures, to  
24 minimize the likelihood of this happening again. Or if it does happen again, to minimize the  
25 length of time that this system would be operating out of compliance or out of specification  
26 mode. All of the systems are back up and operating properly right now.



1 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. I wanted to bring that up as an update from where we were. That we  
2 did go back. I think this will be a recurring thing. We had built it into our O&M plans that we  
3 will systematically go back and make sure that the systems are working the way that they need to  
4 be.

5  
6 Within the other item that was brought up was the sewer discharge that we had on the spill.  
7 There was a response that we came back with. Sheila, I think that we just gave you a response  
8 back to your questions.

9  
10 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Yeah, I was going to comment on that during my Community Report.

11  
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay, then I will just hold for that. Another little bit of Air Force News is I  
13 was asked to go down to an FM station — FM Mix 96 and 100.5 on FM radio. And they went  
14 through an interview with me. They asked me a bunch of questions about what was going on. So  
15 for your information — I think it comes on at 7 in the morning on February 7<sup>th</sup>. Okay. That's it,  
16 Chuck.

17  
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay.

19  
20 Ms. Sheila Guerra: What channel was that?

21  
22 Mr. Paul Brunner: It was Mix 96, so it's FM 96, 96.0, and another FM station, which I think  
23 will be aired simultaneous, is 100.5.

24  
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The next one is yours, too. Review of Action Items.

## Review of Action Items

Mr. Paul Brunner: Does everyone have a copy of the action items? The action items are being passed out. I think there are people in the audience that wanted a copy, a reference to share.

Okay, on the action items, the first one that we have — I will read the action item, “Invite representatives from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to participate in RAB training in March 1999, subject, ‘Biological Opinion’. That is, it will happen — but the training for it — for the Biological Opinion, that’s in your minutes there — is probably representing a June timeframe. So the March timeframe does not look like it is going to happen with Fish and Wildlife. So that’s still open.

The second one is closed, that was accomplished. The third item is, “Prepare a RAB worksheet for the *Community Relations Plan*.”

Ms. Sheila Guerra: Paul can I comment on this Jeannie Lewis?

Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay.

Ms. Sheila Guerra: On that, I have the letters if any RAB members want to take a look at them, I have them.

Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay.

Ms. Sheila Guerra: Or Merianne has them.

Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. Good comments.

1 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Sorry.

2  
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: The third one is, "Prepare a RAB worksheet for *Community Relations*  
4 *Plan*." And that was done. In fact, that will come up later on the worksheet discussion that we  
5 have. The next one is, "Send letter to Brad Gacke, removing him as RAB member." And Chuck,  
6 that is yours. I'm not sure the status on that particular one.

7  
8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The letter has been done, so it's completed.

9  
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: Oh, good. The next one is, "Make changes in RAB Charter and mail to  
11 RAB members." This is a carryover from last meeting. And I believe this one is done, too. I  
12 recommend that we close it. We didn't close it last time because it wasn't known whether people  
13 had copies. Roxanne Yonn from our office had to ask if people who wanted it, and didn't receive  
14 it, to please contact her. And we did not get contacts in that area. If it still needs to be there,  
15 please contact her. But for this sake, I think we can close it, on that particular one.

16  
17 The next one is, "Clarify letter from Air Force attorney advisor, dated September 27, 1998 —  
18 RE: RAB as a quasi-government entity." I'm still — I was working on that letter. My draft  
19 response coming back was over in the legal back and forth. Merianne passed on your comment as  
20 to — is it really...

21  
22 Ms. Sheila Guerra: The question now is...

23  
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: ...are you an arm of the Air Force?

25  
26 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Is the RAB — or is not the RAB, an arm of the Air Force? Please answer  
27 yes or no.

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: And — the...

2  
3 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I don't need all the other details. I already got all...

4  
5 Mr. Paul Brunner: What I heard is that you really wanted our legal department to say yes or  
6 no to that response. Is that accurate?

7  
8 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's it.

9  
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. I take that back. I had my answer, but I heard you wanted the legal  
11 response directly, so I'll get on that.

12  
13 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Well, Merianne said that you received a letter back from Todd Norton on  
14 it and...

15  
16 Mr. Paul Brunner: Actually, it was a comment.

17  
18 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I should have gotten a copy of that but I didn't see it. So I don't know what  
19 he said on that letter. But I do have one letter here.

20  
21 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, the letters that have gone out to you, you have. What I went through,  
22 is that I said that I would write in layman's terms what I thought the letter meant.

23  
24 Ms. Sheila Guerra: And you couldn't figure it out, either?

25  
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, I wrote what it meant and I passed it on to get their cut and make  
27 sure I didn't interpret something wrong. And I got back a rewrite that I needed to then go back

1 and have a chat as to, well — wait a minute now, this is what it means and that's where I'm still  
2 at —in this regard. I think I know what the letter actually means in regard to that. But for the sake  
3 of where we are on the arm of the government, obviously the RAB itself, the members here are  
4 not military members. We're looking for your advice. We're looking for your comments into the  
5 group. The RAB itself is a function that was set to get comments within the restoration  
6 community, within this area where we are, so I'm here within the group — some replacement as  
7 a DoD component would be here.

8  
9 But I don't think the — from my vantage point — I'll get the legal input, final thing. I don't think  
10 the RAB is an arm of the Air Force. We're not looking for you to do all things for us, on that  
11 regard. We're looking for your advice. But the forum that we have here has input. The military is  
12 here working with the community. That aspect of it is part of what we're here for in the military.  
13 So it blends together. But I don't think what you do here, is necessarily an arm of the Air Force.  
14 Okay? And I will get that back as a simple yes or no from the legal.

15  
16 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay, we'll keep that open until you get an answer back?

17  
18 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes. The next one is a listing of number employees from 1995 to current  
19 divided by civilian.

20  
21 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's closed.

22  
23 Mr. Paul Brunner: That was closed last time. In fact, the next one to send each RAB member  
24 a proposed mailing list was closed too, from last time. And the protocol that we have on this, if  
25 we closed an item out from last time, they carry over for people to see them that they were closed  
26 out at the next meeting. Determine cost of each RAB meeting, we did that. That was closed out  
27 last time during that meeting.

1 The next one is, "Update the items on the Web site." That's still open. And we're still working  
2 through. I know that one page, Del, I know we checked, I look at it as still open. We haven't  
3 changed that one. My comment to the staff was if it's there, it does give a generalized thing about  
4 the RAB. It is out of date. In the meantime, just remove it from the Web page. Rather than have  
5 something outdated out there, just remove it, and we'll put the new one on when it gets done. So  
6 this is going to stay open.

7  
8 The next one is, "Discuss the need for an Alternate RAB Membership Application as mentioned  
9 in the bylaws." And that one is yours, Sheila, and I don't know the status directly on that.

10  
11 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I believe Del was going to, weren't you going to...?

12  
13 Mr. Del Callaway: We will have one drafted. We'll present it at Sheila's meeting.

14  
15 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. The next one is, "Report back to the Relative Risk Ranking  
16 Committee the names of bidders for the TAPP program." And I believe that you did that, Chuck,  
17 at least for what we need today.

18  
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That's correct.

20  
21 Mr. Paul Brunner: So, potentially there's another person in the audience who might speak to  
22 the group. So for the sake here, as the TAPP goes through, I think we could probably close this  
23 here, recognizing that other things might come.

24  
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay.

26  
27 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. The next one is, "Assist Imogene Zander and the Piercys to obtain  
28

1 passes, base passes.” And on that, Merianne, why don’t you address that one?

2  
3 Ms. Merianne Briggs: That item still remains open. And I ask that the RAB members  
4 look at your passes. We’re getting a little bit tighter on security. And what is going to be required  
5 now is, if you don’t have a pass that is up-to-date, they will not let you on base. You could  
6 always just go to the little visitors shack there and call me and I’ll see what I can do to get you on  
7 base for that particular visit.

8  
9 But, what we’re going to need to do is make sure that your passes are up-to-date. And the  
10 procedure for that is, if you let me know, we will set up an appointment time and we’ll walk over  
11 together to the security office and get your new pass. And you will be required to bring a current  
12 drivers license, registration, and proof of insurance. That is what they require of everyone who  
13 has a pass on base. So please check and be sure to call me.

14  
15 Mr. Paul Brunner: In regards to you specifically, Linda, most of our meetings are off site  
16 now. Have you tried to come on base? No? With the advent of changing, there are a lot of our  
17 meetings here now, it’s probably not all that crucial. If we were meeting on base it would be  
18 more important to do that. For Imogene and yourself, we are prepared to do that, but it does  
19 require people coming to the base to get that.

20  
21 The next one — well, for on these passes and that — instead of going through it each time,  
22 should I close that or just leave it open? Do you have a preference on that, Linda, should we just  
23 leave it open?

24  
25 Mr. Del Callaway: I think it should be left open because it hasn’t been accomplished yet.

26  
27 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. Linda, do you agree with that?  
28

1 Ms. Linda Piercy: That's fine.

2  
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: The next one is, "Set up a meeting with Rebecca Garrison on the Ride  
4 Share Program in the near future." Sheila, from what I think, that's yours, too. But that still has  
5 not happened, correct?

6  
7 Ms. Sheila Guerra: No.

8  
9 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. So that remains open. And Chuck, that's all the open action items.

10  
11 **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

12  
13 **Community Relations**

14  
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Then we will go to Community Relations Committee Reports.  
16 That's where we start on the Community Reports, Community Relations with Sheila Guerra.

17  
18 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay, I wasn't at that last — can you all hear me?...at the meeting, which  
19 was December 16<sup>th</sup>. And thank you, Del, for chairing that meeting.

20  
21 Mr. Del Callaway: You're welcome.

22  
23 Ms. Sheila Guerra: We did table a lot of things. And we'll be picking up on that at the next  
24 meeting, which will be March 17<sup>th</sup>. All the minutes are current and approved. They did go  
25 through the action items. And they did have some discussion on — they did make a motion on  
26 two new RAB member people who want to be RAB members. And I'm asking tonight to  
27 probably step out of that committee for a minute, because there's one of those people who did  
28



1 not — was not included in that motion. However, I have talked to that person, which is Gary  
2 Collier, and the other person is Erwin Hayer. And I don't see any reason not to make a motion to  
3 accept him as a RAB member. And Chuck, you want to, does anyone have any objection to that?  
4

5 Mr. Del Callaway: I would have an objection to not following our procedures that we have set  
6 up, that should go back to your meeting and be recommended by your committee. If we bypass  
7 that process, then we can do that with just anybody; then we would not have rules and regulations  
8 to follow.  
9

10 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Chuck?  
11

12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, I had to have my Charter, Bylaws, and RAB Rules of Order  
13 with me, but I don't at this time. I don't recall anything, any procedures as far as accepting  
14 members. I know the community — the members are suppose to be going through the  
15 Community Relations Committee, but in accepting new members, I don't know what refers to  
16 any particular procedure in doing that.  
17

18 Ms. Sheila Guerra: There really isn't. It's just that has been the way we have done business in  
19 the past. Any new potential RAB people would come to the Community Relations meeting and  
20 have an application. And then we would have the opportunity to ask those people questions.  
21 Several times some people didn't show up and we just made a motion not to accept them. At this  
22 point, there was a little confusion on why Gary was not — why they didn't make a motion on  
23 Gary. I had not seen his application and things got kind of switched around with the applicants. I  
24 had already spoken with Erwin Hayer and I didn't really have anything else to ask Erwin Hayer.  
25 However, I didn't see Gary's application and that's why the motion was not made at that time for  
26 Gary. So I just want to let everyone know that there was a little confusion there.  
27  
28

1 So it would be up to the RAB. I don't know how to do this because — I mean I have one RAB  
2 member who is against going out of the committee. In other words, I'd have to wait until the next  
3 CR meeting on March 17<sup>th</sup> to make another motion to accept Gary, and make that motion at that  
4 time and wait and come back at the next RAB meeting, which I believe is going to be...

5  
6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: It should be in March, the 1st of March.

7  
8 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Yeah, but we don't have our CR meeting until the 17<sup>th</sup>. So therefore, we  
9 would have to wait until the next RAB meeting, which will be four months. Right?

10  
11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No. We can have one in March. We have a RAB meeting.

12  
13 Ms. Sheila Guerra: March what?

14  
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The first part of March.

16  
17 Ms. Sheila Guerra: The CR meeting is not until the 17th.

18  
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, the 17th of March?

20  
21 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Right. So the motion will be made after the next RAB meeting. so that's  
22 what I'm saying.

23  
24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: But we can still call a meeting before March 17<sup>th</sup>, the Community  
25 Relations Committee, and just to meet and...

26  
27 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Can we have an Adhoc Committee or something of that sort...?  
28

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Right, just a Community Relations meeting...

2  
3 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Then we could make a motion at the next RAB meeting.

4  
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Formally, just for the purpose of accepting Gary, if that would be  
6 alright for Gary.

7  
8 Mr. Gary Collier: That's fine with me. But can't you do it right now? If you call an Adhoc  
9 meeting, this is going to put me off.

10  
11 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Excuse me, Gary, would you please step up to the microphone so we can  
12 record this? Thank you.

13  
14 Mr. Gary Collier: I appreciate you listening to my scenario.

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Why don't you state your name and where you live and all that?

17  
18 Mr. Gary Collier: My name is Gary Collier and I applied for this quite a while back. And I  
19 did attend, I was on the agenda. I understand the problem occurred that Del ... didn't want to  
20 take the responsibility of the chairmanship at that time. However, what is going to happen is, if  
21 I'm put off until March, I'm not going to be able to go to the RAB Caucus and I have some  
22 issues that I wanted to speak to at that caucus...

23  
24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That's true.

25  
26 Mr. Gary Collier: ...that are of great importance this RAB.

1 Mr. Del Callaway: Could you share those issues with us?

2  
3 Mr. Gary Collier: Primarily, I want to talk to people regarding formally-utilized defense  
4 sites. And as I mentioned before...

5  
6 Mr. Del Callaway: Parker Homes?

7  
8 Mr. Gary Collier: Exactly. And this has a great deal to do with the whole RAB, because in  
9 two years we're going to be using a designation of a formally-utilized defense site. If they will  
10 not address now, Parker Homes, are they going to address McClellan as a FUD? It's very clear  
11 we have to get this addressed now. And I believe that is something that needs to be done.

12  
13 But first and foremost, to me it seems an egregious act to keep putting off. I have gone through  
14 all the hoops. I've been there. I've come to the meetings. If you can have an Adhoc meeting in  
15 March just before that, why can't you do it today during a recess?

16  
17 Mr. Del Callaway: First of all, you haven't been put off. Your application was not circulated  
18 properly. I didn't see it and the committee didn't see it, and I'm on that committee. You weren't  
19 singled out just because it was you. But now that you have mentioned Parker Homes, this is the  
20 third time I've heard Parker Homes come up, and I think you have your own agenda. I didn't  
21 want to get into that tonight.

22  
23 I wanted to do that in the privacy of a subcommittee, to give you the questions so you can answer  
24 them. I think that you have your own agenda and you are not interested in the RAB. You are  
25 interested in Parker Homes and your own agenda.

26  
27 Mr. Gary Collier: That can be the farthest from the truth. Particularly regarding you not  
28

1 seeing my application. It was at the CRC meeting. You did review it, but you didn't want to  
2 proceed. I don't want to get into nit picking...

3  
4 Mr. Del Callaway: You're incorrect.

5  
6 Mr. Gary Collier: Sir?

7  
8 Mr. Del Callaway: You're incorrect.

9  
10 Mr. Gary Collier: However, I have spoken at other meetings regarding many issues in  
11 regards to environmental acts that have occurred on this base. Particularly regarding the EVOC. I  
12 have written letters to a variety of officials in my capacity as East Del Paso Target Area  
13 Committee. We have also dealt with issues regarding McClellan reuse.

14  
15 I have an agenda of course with Parker Homes, and I believe that it is properly a formally-utilized  
16 defense site and this is a proper forum for that. Other RABs do address formally-utilized defense  
17 sites. That is — until I get an answer on that from the Air Force, that is going to be an issue that I  
18 will want to see addressed. I think anyone else in this community would expect the same thing.

19  
20 Mr. Del Callaway: I think you did make a correct statement, I did see your application.

21  
22 Mr. Gary Collier: Thank you.

23  
24 Mr. Del Callaway: I saw it that night. That was the first time I saw it. I saw it for about 10 or  
25 15 minutes prior to taking action on the other gentleman here. And at that time I advised you that  
26 that was the first I saw that. That it had been in Merianne's hands or someone else's hands all of  
27 this time. And we didn't know about it and Sheila didn't know about it. We knew you were

1 going to be there, that's true.

2  
3 Mr. Gary Collier: Mr. Callaway, I'd like to ask a question.

4  
5 Mr. Del Callaway: Go ahead.

6  
7 Mr. Gary Collier: Did you take action on the other gentleman without an application being  
8 present?

9  
10 Mr. Del Callaway: No. But I had seen it previously and I had talked with him previously. And  
11 you sat in the audience as a member of the audience, and not a member of this committee. And  
12 all of the things that you say you brought up, that's all well and good and that's what everybody's  
13 sitting out there for — is to bring those issues up, bring them to this committee, so that we can  
14 discuss them with the Air Force. If I have already made my recommendation. And if...

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I appreciate what you said, Del. And I appreciate what you said,  
17 Gary. And basically, as far as the RAB Caucus goes, I think I would not have any problem, since  
18 I know the people who are running the RAB Caucus, to get you in there as a prospective RAB  
19 member. I think they will accept you as such and I think I can get you onto that agenda — onto  
20 the Caucus. If you really want to go to a Caucus meeting, I can get you there and make you a part  
21 of it. See me afterward I will get you onto that.

22  
23 What I think we should do is follow what Del is saying here. I think what we should do — we  
24 can't do it tonight, it's obvious we've got too much conflict here. But we can have an Adhoc —  
25 well, not an Adhoc committee, just a Community Relations Committee — call an emergency  
26 meeting to accept you as our member before our next meeting, which would be in March.

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: I believe it's March 3rd.

2  
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So we can accept you by March 3rd our regular RAB meeting. That  
4 way, we don't have conflict and we don't have to battle it out here in front of the public and  
5 stuff. I think that's the best way to handle it. I can get you onto the hearing here with the RAB  
6 Caucus — no problem. I'm sure I can. I'll work at it.

7  
8 Mr. Gary Collier: All right. Thank you, sir.

9  
10 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Thank you, Gary.

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And thank you for your time.

13  
14 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I'd like to go ahead and make the date for that special meeting. February  
15 24<sup>th</sup>. Is that all right?

16  
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Fine.

18  
19 Ms. Merianne Briggs: We do have a RAB training workshop on February 25<sup>th</sup>.

20  
21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Why don't we make it — you know this is going to happen so fast.

22  
23 Ms. Sheila Guerra: We can do it after the workshop.

24  
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Why don't we, either after or before the workshop? What time  
26 does the workshop start?

1 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's fine with me.

2  
3 Ms. Merianne Briggs: The workshop will start at 6:30 and it will be here at Vineland.

4  
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So when do you want to have it, before or after the training?

6  
7 Ms. Sheila Guerra: What time was it?

8  
9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: 6:30.

10  
11 Ms. Merianne Briggs: 6:30 it starts.

12  
13 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Let's make it for 6:00 then.

14  
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay.

16  
17 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Is that a problem with you, Chuck, getting there?

18  
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No.

20  
21 Ms. Sheila Guerra: How about you, Del?

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Why don't we make it 6:15 for all you RAB Community Relations  
24 Committee [members] that can be there. Or does anyone have a problem with that time and  
25 would rather have it after the meeting? Okay.

26  
27 Mr. Paul Brunner: Sounds good.



1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So we will have it at 15 minutes after then. Gary, if you can be  
2 there at that meeting — and the training, you can stay for the training.

3  
4 Mr. Gary Collier: February 25<sup>th</sup>.

5  
6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: February 25<sup>th</sup> at 6:15. Then we'll have a special meeting before our  
7 RAB training, which you can stay for if you're a RAB member. Even if you're not you can stay  
8 for it.

9  
10 Mr. Del Callaway: Don't forget to notify all the members of that committee.

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Right. We should do that. Is that agreeable to you, Del?

13  
14 Mr. Del Callaway: Yeah.

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay.

17  
18 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I guess we can go on with the motion that was made at the CR meeting to  
19 accept Erwin Hayer as a RAB member.

20  
21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I second that. Well, I can't second that.

22  
23 Ms. Sheila Guerra: We already made the motion.

24  
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: You made the motion to accept?

26  
27 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Right, now we're going to vote on it.

1 Mr. Chuck: We haven't had a second. Who seconded it?

2  
3 Ms. Linda Piercy: I second it.

4  
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, all those in favor, lift your right hand please. Okay.

6 Welcome, Erwin. You're now a member of the Restoration Advisory Board.

7  
8 Ms. Sheila Guerra: You haven't completed the new application for RAB members. We're  
9 going to do that at the next ... okay. Community Relations update, I believe Merianne gave us an  
10 update on the Information Repository, the Boy Scouts activities, and the mailing list expansion.

11  
12 The Information Repository should have been transferred over from the Rio Linda Community  
13 Center. That should be in place at the Rio Linda Library. The Boy Scouts activities are scheduled  
14 for a Creek Week and the mailing list expansion the, \$16,000 — 60,000 more people on the list  
15 — that's been deleted. The new RAB calendars, those are the ones you received in the mail. I just  
16 want to briefly touch base on this because I wasn't there — and this I guess is a one-time  
17 calendar, Merianne?

18  
19 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Yes, it would be. That's just to get the calendar out to the public in  
20 hopes that they'll have that for...

21  
22 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I just thought — this is my comment on it. Myself, personally, I would  
23 have done it as an insert. And I would have used that page to update on the sewer spill and things  
24 of cleanup. There's a lot of things that could have been there. And this could have been an insert.  
25 And that's about it. And the other comment I had on the RAB public meeting, the advertisement,  
26 the public notices, those have changed the format on them. Are they all going to be like this or,  
27 because these are a different size.

1 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Yes, we have changed the size. We're testing that out because we're trying  
2 to lower the cost since we are doing it twice the number of times — because we have eight  
3 meetings a year instead of four to advertise. The ads' larger size was costing approximately  
4 \$1,300. These are down to about \$899. I believe it was right around there at \$800 – \$900.

5  
6 Ms. Sheila Guerra: How much were the other ones, you said?

7  
8 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: \$1,300. So we are just seeing what the difference would be or the  
9 response. It's just not putting as much detail, but making the actual meeting bigger.

10  
11 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Now, do they charge you more for the wording per line?

12  
13 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: No, it's done by size, by inch.

14  
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: If you really want to get into that, why don't we do that in the  
16 Community Relations meeting?

17  
18 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I had just noticed the change, because I usually cut these out to make sure  
19 that they are in the paper — that they're there.

20  
21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I understand. But we want to get going.

22  
23 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay, I'm moving on. Information Repository, Boy Scouts — I did that.  
24 Mailing list, calendar, and the Ride Share issue. I'm still kind of working on that. I'm waiting to  
25 hear from another person. I also — since the last meeting received the Hoyt Report for 1996 and  
26 I'm waiting for a response from that.

1 Did you guys discuss the setup for the room? Because that was on the agenda.

2  
3 Mr. Del Callaway: No.

4  
5 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay, that wasn't discussed. And we did get an update for the RAB  
6 member list and the cost of the committee meetings. Did everyone get that information? On the  
7 committee meetings was \$1,155. I also have a comment that Roxanne's time at these committee  
8 meetings, she is not getting paid to be at these meetings. She gets — she earns time off from her  
9 employer. Right? So her time at the committee meetings, she's not being paid extra for that. I just  
10 wanted to let you know about that.

11  
12 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Did you want me to clarify that? I get paid 40 hours a week and I just  
13 adjust my time if there's a committee meeting or a RAB meeting like tonight. So it doesn't go  
14 beyond the 40 hours a week.

15  
16 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay. The other comment I wanted to mention was, I asked at the last  
17 RAB meeting about the sewer spill. I asked Major Gonzales. I called him the next day and I  
18 asked him a number of questions. I haven't had time to really look at this, so I'm not going to  
19 give comment on it tonight. But I will give comment at the next RAB meeting.

20  
21 Ms. Merianne Briggs: May I ask you, for the record, could we list the people who have  
22 resigned for the record?

23  
24 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Yes. That was Jeannie Lewis and, what was the other guy's name?

25  
26 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Tom O'Donnell from AFGE.

1 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I have their resignation letters, if you want to see them. Merianne, did you  
2 have anything else?

3  
4 Ms Merianne Briggs: No, that's all.

5  
6 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Del, did you have anything else?

7  
8 Mr. Del Callaway: No.

9  
10 Ms. Sheila Guerra: No? Okay, that's it.

11  
12 **Base Reuse/Relative Risk Ranking**

13  
14 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, thank you very much. We're going to move on from this to  
15 our Base Reuse and Relative Risk Ranking Committee and Del Callaway.

16  
17 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay, Barry is still sick so there's not a whole lot of action in the Relative  
18 Risk Ranking. I asked at the last meeting who is the point of contact for that. It has changed  
19 several times, so I can get in contact for whoever is your point of contact for base reuse. It is  
20 Rick. So he and I communicate back and forth, but I need that other person so that I can get  
21 involved in the meeting that takes place with Joe and Alex. Do you have a representative from  
22 Relative Risk Ranking attending your meeting?

23  
24 Mr. Joe Healy: Do you mean replacing Bill? At our agency meetings, which we're  
25 actually going to start day two tomorrow — two-day meetings, there was no RAB representative.

26  
27 Mr. Del Callaway: Yeah, I'd like to get — Barry was going to attend but he's been sick. So I'd  
28

1 like to get somebody to attend. If they don't, maybe I'll have to come over and sit with you.

2  
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: As far as the Relative Risk person — in some regards, Del, that term is  
4 moving in the cleanup efforts that we have now. It is not really a factor so much in our project as  
5 we go to close.

6  
7 The group has been really focusing on reuse, you are right, with Rick. That's probably why we're  
8 not providing answers or giving you data to review in that relative — your comment at the  
9 meeting is that — where we were for writing information is, since we are not using that very  
10 much anymore, it's more on reuse activities cleanup to move versus using relative risk for  
11 ranking-and-stacking projects. In fact, in the closure business with AFBCA, the Air Force Base  
12 Conversion Agency, they deleted that requirement from our criteria — even to take into account  
13 anymore. Doesn't mean we might not, we would still use risk in our factor. That would be kind  
14 of hard for us to say, "This is my person to go do that." But if there is that need with risk and  
15 where we are — I think where we would go is probably talk to Elaine. Elaine would probably be  
16 your point.

17  
18 Mr. Del Callaway: I'm not getting any answers on a lot of issues that are still hanging out  
19 there. I just casually mentioned to Jerry tonight about that fence over there. That fence is still up  
20 around that contaminated area, not along the runway. But we need to know what's happening and  
21 how we can assist you, or advise you, and what you're doing out there.

22  
23 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, that was a component for that.

24  
25 Mr. Del Callaway: So that point of contact, we still need that person. Like I say for Reuse, we  
26 have Rick. And, by the way, we did overlook an action item that Rick was going to speak to  
27 tonight. So I think if you are ready Rick, would you like to do that now?

1 Mr. Rick Solander: Sure.

3 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay.

5 Mr. Rick Solander: Good evening. My name is Rick Solander. I work for Environmental  
6 Management in the Transition Division. And Del asked me to speak to you tonight about the  
7 consultation that we're doing with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

8  
9 We discussed this at the Reuse Committee meetings. And with this is the consultation that is  
10 required under the Endangered Species Act when the federal government does a Federal Action.  
11 In this case, the Federal Action is that we're disposing a property, meaning that we're  
12 transferring the property over the next few years to the County of Sacramento. So that's the  
13 Federal Action that drives us under the Endangered Species Act to consult with the Fish and  
14 Wildlife Services.

15  
16 So what I've provided here is just a quick update on where we are in that consultation. As you  
17 see from the overhead, and Roxanne is passing out handouts for everybody, it's front to back,  
18 there are four slides total, so make sure you turn over to the other side when I get to that point.

19  
20 On the 5<sup>th</sup> of May 1998, the Fish and Wildlife Service provided us a letter that allowed us to  
21 transfer property or convey property under a lease situation to the County of Sacramento before  
22 we finished consultation. What they did in this letter is they told us that we would have to hold  
23 back the areas that include sensitive habitats and wait until we finished consultation of that. So  
24 that letter allows us to start to reuse the base without waiting for the long process of consultation  
25 to conclude.

26  
27 So we got that letter. After that, to continue the process of consultation, we submitted a project  
28

1 description on, as you can see from the slide, 12 June 98 to the Fish and Wildlife Service. What  
2 that project description did is describe the Federal Action, basically the disposal of the property.  
3 Basically took the information that we had in the Environmental Impact Statement that many of  
4 you have read and provided that to Fish and Wildlife Service.

5  
6 Right now the Fish and Wildlife Service is reviewing those documents and we continue to  
7 interact with them and have meetings. Next slide please.

8  
9 Couple of weeks ago, to continue with the process, Fish and Wildlife did visit our off-site  
10 properties. About six months ago, they did look at the on-site properties and you guys have  
11 talked about that in this meeting with the West Area Restoration Project. They hadn't had a  
12 chance to look at the off-sites. So we took them out to the Davis site, we took them out to Camp  
13 Kohler, we took them out to the North Area Transfer Station. We didn't take them out to Lincoln  
14 because Lincoln is not part of the disposal. That was not included in the decision to close  
15 McClellan. That's going to be transferred to Beale. So they're not really interested in that as part  
16 of this process. So we'll deal with that later.

17  
18 So we did that with Fish and Wildlife Service. The reason why it is taking so much time for us to  
19 go through this, is they are limited on staff. So we're estimating right now that we'll have  
20 consultation concluded some time in the spring. That's why Paul mentioned to you that it's  
21 looking like June, that Fish and Wildlife Service will come in here and conduct training for you.  
22 We will finish consultation and then, shortly after that, we will set up a meeting for them to come  
23 talk to you and explain to you what that opinion means.

24  
25 The last one on the slide is, to reiterate what I said earlier, that we are not going to transfer any  
26 property that has sensitive habitats on it until we conclude this consultation. Next slide please.



1 What I wanted to do here in this last slide is just talk about in brief terms what this opinion is  
2 going to do. And you can see from the bullets there that what it is basically going to do is  
3 describe in pretty good detail the effects that the action, i.e., disposal, that's going to have on the  
4 sensitive habitats. It's also going to talk about any alternatives that may need to be implemented  
5 to prevent us from doing any destruction to any habitats or jeopardizing the habitats.

6  
7 What we have written into our lease documents so far is that very statement, that if any new users  
8 that come on base will have to comply strictly with all the requirements of the Biological  
9 Opinion. For instance, if the Biological Opinion says that you cannot develop in the Western  
10 Area, then the new user cannot develop in the Western Area. This document can be pretty  
11 important. It has the clout of law. I think in previous discussions that's been noted. So whatever  
12 this thing says, it will hold its weight in gold for the future users. If they want to deviate from that  
13 then they have to enter into further consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

14  
15 That's all I have. Any questions?

16  
17 Mr. Frank Miller: Frank Miller. A question to Rick Solander. How much are the damages  
18 that Environmental Management cost to the environment out there? What's the total cost?

19  
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: Rick, I don't think that you can really...

21  
22 Mr. Rick Solander: I was going to say I can't answer that and what I wanted to say, since you  
23 brought that up, is that this Biological Opinion is not connected with the previous discussions  
24 we've had on the West Area mitigation. The results of that West Area restoration will fold into  
25 this Biological Opinion. But this is not really connected to it. I cannot answer the question that  
26 you just asked. Are we going to take that back and try to find that, Paul?

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: I'm not sure the question can be answered, it is sort of like, "Why is the  
2 sky blue?" It's what the damage is from the base. I don't know how to put that in context as to  
3 how to respond.

4  
5 Mr. Del Callaway: Thank you, Rick. I don't — that's an action item. Roxanne had a handout  
6 that she was going to — on the reuse.

7  
8 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: One on the cleanup status.

9  
10 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay.

11  
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think the cleanup status is what Elaine briefs later on, I believe.

13  
14 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay. Is Elaine the point of contact for...

15  
16 Mr. Paul Brunner: For the Reuse Relative Risk, until we give you someone else, I'd say yes.

17  
18 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay, you could have told me that a while ago.

19  
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: I mentioned that, I thought, Del, as we went through that.

21  
22 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay, so I'll be contacting Elaine for more information.

23  
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think that works.

25  
26 Mr. Del Callaway: You were going to ask me something Rick? So you're going to pass the  
27 handout when she's...

1 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Yes, I'll go ahead and pass it out so it...

2  
3 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay, all right. The only other reuse items I recall came from Rob  
4 Leonard's office was Buildings 786, 783, and 788. That's still the plastics firm anticipating  
5 coming in. That's as much as I know about it. I don't know where they're at in the negotiations  
6 or anything like that. The tire company, I guess they're already in. Is that correct? Sacramento  
7 Tire?

8  
9 Unknown Female: No.

10  
11 Mr. Del Callaway: They're not in yet, either? Okay. One other company, I don't know who  
12 they were, the ones with the trash cans out there. Looks like they got 10,000 trash cans. The big  
13 containers.

14  
15 Mr. Paul Brunner: Del, for the sake as we go through that — I did ask Roxanne and them to  
16 make a copy of what Rick briefs at the BCT.

17  
18 Mr. Del Callaway: That's what I was looking for.

19  
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: If that's what you're referencing, we did have that. I think if we hand that  
21 out, what is being handed out for folks, is the — there is another form that's more of an Air  
22 Force agency meeting, called BRAC Cleanup Team, where the regulatory folks meet with us to  
23 work on issues specifically.

24  
25 One of the agenda items we go over monthly, and Chuck usually comes and Del attends when he  
26 has the opportunity. It's a listing of the reuse actions that we know about that we've been turned  
27 onto work on environmental actions within the Air Force to do. So what's on this sheet is a  
28

1 listing of the activities. The top page is the things that we know for sure that are happening.  
2 There's a list of things down below that could happen.

3  
4 And Mark Manoff or Leonard that comes to Del's Reuse meetings, address issues. Usually  
5 they're addressing these things at the BRAC Cleanup Team meeting. They also come and address  
6 these actions at the Reuse meeting. So they come at two forums toward these issues. But this is  
7 the status of what we know in regards to the various projects from my office.

8  
9 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay. Yes, that's what I was referring to. The California Builders Supply  
10 is a tentative unit coming in and the Sacramento Truck Tire Company, plus the plastics company.

11  
12 That's about all I have. Except this morning I got word that I'm going to be going to Tinker Air  
13 Force Base, Oklahoma, for a week. And I'll be leaving Sunday. So I won't be back until the  
14 following Saturday afternoon. I guess I'll give you a call or something and stay in touch as far as  
15 some of this stuff goes. Okay. That's it.

## 16 17 **Technical Report Review**

18  
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. Now the Technical Review Committee. And that's yours,  
20 truly. And right off the bat, I'd like to pass out an informational item to all of you. It concerns our  
21 community correspondence cards or community relations cards, whatever you want to say. The  
22 Department of Defense has decided now that it would be okay for Air Force employees to have  
23 them. Paul and I have talked this over. There's a good possibility now, I guess we as Restoration  
24 Advisory Boards, since we deal with the community and also agencies, that we now can have  
25 these correspondence cards, community relations-type cards to give out to the public when we're  
26 asked. I'm going to pass these around so you can read what's been declared by OPM, our general  
27 accounting office, really.

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes they — the real difference I think after we went through, we did  
2 produce the cards before — I did it on my computer at home for the RAB members to get those  
3 out. What the new policy is, I can get the government systems to do it instead of me doing it.  
4

5 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Are they going to be cut?  
6

7 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes, I think we can do that Sheila, yes.  
8

9 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Because I had trouble cutting them, because I couldn't get them all  
10 straight. I mean they were a mess.  
11

12 Mr. Paul Brunner: I can imagine.  
13

14 Ms. Sheila Guerra: But I took one and had my own cards printed up in black and white.  
15

16 Mr. Paul Brunner: So we'll work that out. The decision is a turnabout from where they were  
17 before, so it was a reversal what they said could be done now. In fact, yesterday I got some other  
18 guidance from the financial community about that, that still said we could do it in that regard. So  
19 it's a step forward.  
20

21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So make sure all of your personal information is correct so that  
22 when they go to make the cards for us, they'll be able to put it all right on the card. You know,  
23 like your e-mail address — if you have a fax or so, that they can get it on the card. So that when  
24 you give it to a community member or you go to a conference or something you'd be able to give  
25 someone that they'll be able to e-mail or fax you something. Okay? You can have your home or  
26 work phone on there, if you want to, address and so forth. So that's just an item of good news.  
27  
28

1 The other thing is, I want to take care of this one issue here. And then go on to the TAPP because  
2 we have some contractors out here that are interested in the TAPP program. They want to  
3 introduce themselves and their company and let you take a look at them. Then we can go into  
4 that a little bit.

5  
6 Anyhow, I'm going to pass them around here to you. This is concerning the Regional Board and  
7 McClellan Air Force Base. We addressed this one time before. If you notice there is a paragraph  
8 blocked off in the front there and one on the second page, I blocked off for you. It basically  
9 explains what the State Water Board Resolution 92-49, the cleanup criteria defined in the *Basin*  
10 *Plan* is. ARARs, they call it.

11  
12 So basically, what the recommendation would be, is the same that we make tonight is the same as  
13 it is down here outlined on the bottom of the first page. What's happened is, the Regional Board  
14 is adopting a resolution confirming that the *Basin Plan* and State Water Board Resolution 92-49  
15 are ARARs for soil and groundwater cleanup. And so it is called Appropriate Relevant and  
16 Appropriate Requirements, ARARs. Am I pronouncing that right?

17  
18 Mr. Paul Brunner: Applicable and appropriate.

19  
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Applicable and requirements, okay? That's on the top paragraph  
21 there under subject. Basically, what we approved the first time as the Restoration Advisory Board  
22 unanimously, was to back the Board when it came to water quality of cleaning the water in the  
23 ground to water quality objectives, rather particularly the water, the ground to a level where the  
24 water would not exceed water quality objectives, which is one case of cancer in one million.  
25 Whereas the Air Force right now is sort of backing a plan for maximum contaminant levels.  
26 That's where contaminants in your well, once they find and you can have several contaminants  
27 but if one contaminant gets, like TCE, trichloroethylene, gets above 5 parts per billion in your  
28

1 well at home or on base, unless there's a proper cleanup procedure in the water filter or what to  
2 take it out, then you're supposed to shut down that well. That's maximum contaminant level. But  
3 that is not one new case of cancer in one million people. So basically, what we approved was the  
4 stricter of the two levels. Water quality objectives is stricter than maximum contaminant levels.  
5 Because it is lower than where you would necessarily turn off that well.

6  
7 So, I'm recommending that we — once again they have come up with a compromise to save  
8 money, the Regional Water Board has. That compromise is on the second page and it tells you  
9 about it. And says that only 1 to 2 percent, that's on the front part really, 1 to 2 percent of the  
10 plume will stay above 1 in a million cancer risk. It is going to cost like \$6.5 million over 147  
11 years, more to do that. We're talking about price, it's like \$175 million. So it's not very much  
12 when you spread it out over a long period of time, considering the actual cost, it's way up there.

13  
14 So, I'm making a recommendation, in fact, I'll make a motion that we once again back the  
15 Regional Water Quality Board and Alex MacDonald in adopting the resolution confirming the  
16 Basin Plan and State Water Board Resolution 92-49 ARARs for soil and groundwater cleanup;  
17 and that that cleanup level should be water quality objectives. But that we concur with the  
18 compromise in order to save money. So that just leaves 1 to 2 percent of the plume above the  
19 water quality objectives, but underneath the maximum contaminant levels. Just 1 to 2 percent  
20 would be above the water quality objective but less than MCLs, 1 to 2 percent of the plume.

21  
22 Now that means the rest of it is going to be water quality objectives or lower. So I make a motion  
23 that we accept the recommendation that's written on this letter as so, except that the levels be  
24 cleaned as recommended — down to 1 to 2 percent of the plume being above water quality  
25 objectives but below MCLs, and that the rest of it be at water quality objectives or below.

26  
27 Mr. Del Callaway: Question. Who has the authority to change this after we vote on it?  
28

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: This is just an example.

2  
3 Mr. Del Callaway: I understand. They have written their recommendations about the 1 or 2  
4 percent. But who does it take to change that? Do you have to have a Board meeting and your  
5 Board has to agree, or some yahoo out in the field?

6  
7 Mr. Alex MacDonald: This whole issue isn't what the Board is saying what the cleanup  
8 number is or is not going to be. The resolution that was signed by Board for this item, basically  
9 restated our position that the requirements we have on the books are requirements that must be  
10 met and the Air Force must meet those. It did not set what the cleanup number is going to be.  
11 That's going to be coming out when we have a final Feasibility Study — that's going to come out  
12 with a Proposed Plan and a Record of Decision will be written. At that point in time, the Air  
13 Force will make their recommendation for what their preferred alternative is. I don't know what  
14 that's going to be right now. It might change because the Feasibility Study is going on a revision  
15 at this time. So at that point in time, it might be that they choose the alternative that I would  
16 choose. I don't know that. If not, we would have bantering back and forth. I would have to have  
17 my Board agree with my position, but I can't say that at this time. So we don't have, we have not  
18 selected — this is the alternative that I would choose. The Board isn't backing me yet on this  
19 issue, because that has not been officially proposed in any sort of document.

20  
21 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay. So why would we accept this instead of — in lieu of this?

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: What are you talking about now?

24  
25 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, if this hasn't been accepted...

26  
27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, we're just going to support the idea of what he's come up  
28



1 with on this plan here.

2  
3 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Del, this was my recommendation — my comments on the existing  
4 *Feasibility Study*, the *Draft Final Version II*, this was one of my recommendations for the Air  
5 Force. They will actually be evaluating this alternative in the next version.

6  
7 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay.

8  
9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So I would recommend that we support that.

10  
11 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay, I'll second your motion.

12  
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, any discussion?

14  
15 Mr. Del Callaway: I guess I got the cart before the horse.

16  
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, no discussion. Then all in favor please lift your right hand  
18 please. Okay. All those who disapprove do the same. All those who abstain do the same. Okay,  
19 looks like unanimous vote. Thank you very much.

20  
21 **The TAPP Program**

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Now we can go into the TAPP program. After we introduce the  
24 company people here that want to address the RAB tonight, you got five minutes to present. Just  
25 come up to the microphone and tell who you are, your name, and the company you represent, and  
26 a little bit about what you've done in the way of cleanup activities or whatever you want to  
27 address the RAB. So I just invite the first one to come up here if you'd like to take the stand first.

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: As they come, let me make a comment to the audience as to what TAPP is.  
2 There is a program that has been offered by DoD to help the RAB have a third-party consultant  
3 review documents, other than using Air Force inputs directly. And the government would  
4 contract through that, as an Air Force contracting. So, what we've been doing is having potential  
5 candidates come not necessarily to do competition, that's part of the source selection process that  
6 will go on, but at least to let people be familiar of who's out there. The competition would take  
7 place and there's a process — that I know that Chuck's been working on with this Technical  
8 Team back and forth, that has to take place. So as the people come, it's not where you are trying,  
9 the group is trying to decide, "Yes, I'm going get that guy," or that it's really just making us  
10 aware as to who is out there.

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, if you don't mind, whoever would like to take the stand first,  
13 just start at the podium here, introduce yourself and the company that you represent.

14  
15 Mr. Del Callaway: The other guy left.

16  
17 Mr. Michael Acton: Thank you for this opportunity. I'm Michael Acton. I work with Acton  
18 Mickelson Environmental. We're a local environmental consulting firm based in El Dorado  
19 Hills. We've been in business in this area for eight years now. My business partner, Barbara  
20 Michaelson, and I have approximately 40 years total experience in the environmental consulting  
21 business. We have a staff of approximately 15 people composed of geologists, engineers,  
22 chemists, and soil scientists. Professionals from our firm have done work here at McClellan on  
23 vapor extraction operation and pilot testing. We've done work at Mather on landfill closure  
24 projects. We've done work at Palmdale and Edwards Air Force bases doing RI/FS Phase II  
25 investigations. We do private sector work also. We're working at a former ordnance facility in  
26 Southern California where we are addressing soil and groundwater contamination issues related  
27 to TCE and percolates. Those projects involve vapor extraction of TCE where we have removed  
28

1 49,000 pounds of TCE from the soil via vapor extraction with catalytic oxidation.

2  
3 We're doing work at a currently operating ordnance facility in Central California now, that has  
4 TCE and percolates in groundwater. Many in our field are awaiting the results of percolates  
5 treatment option testing that has been done at AeroJet and in the San Gabriel Valley in Los  
6 Angeles. We ourselves are doing pilot testing on these two projects. Both of these projects are  
7 moving through RI/FS phase.

8  
9 In summary, we feel that we're well-positioned and qualified to provide some assistance in the  
10 Technical Assistance Program, and we will hopefully be submitting a bid package when the  
11 appropriate time comes. Thank you.

12  
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. I believe there was one other person that was — I forget her  
14 name. She was supposed to be here addressing for one other company. Is she here in the audience  
15 with us tonight? I guess not. I guess that's the only one we had.

16  
17 So we can go on and tell you about the TAPP. We have a meeting coming up on the Technical  
18 Assistance Program, the TAPP, which would be if I remember right — 11<sup>th</sup> of February, which  
19 was a Thursday. And it's at 6:30, and the only thing this meeting is going to cover is the  
20 Technical Assistance Grant. We have several things that we need to go over and talk about. One  
21 thing is whether we want to go with a five-year contract and go out open bid in the — what was  
22 that newsletter called?

23  
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: *Commerce Business Daily*.

25  
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: *Commerce Business Daily*, I'll get it right. And so that would be  
27 advertised in there for various firms. And we would have five years to go through — \$100,000 is  
28

1 the “max” on this. So, you know, you get one year, you write a statement of work and, matter of  
2 fact, there is a Statement of Work — just a draft form of it right now for us to review.

3  
4 There is another way we can do this and that is to have separate one-year contracts of up to  
5 \$25,000 and just do this yearly. And we would have to write up a new contract every year. There  
6 has not been any decisions on this yet. We did not make any decisions this last meeting. In fact, I  
7 wanted everybody here to hear what it was all about. But if you want to see, if you want to be  
8 part of this, and I would strongly encourage every RAB member to be, because this is going to  
9 people who are performing this work for us — they’re going to be our consultants. They’re going  
10 to be the ones that are going to be looking at these Air Force documents and so forth and giving  
11 us recommendations. So we better pay attention to who is going to be doing that because that is  
12 going to weight heavily on our decision making, I would think. I encourage everyone to come out  
13 on the 11<sup>th</sup> of February. Hopefully the meeting won’t last too long, because it is going to be  
14 dealing specifically with this TAPP.

15  
16 Just trying to think of what we really need to discuss. If we decide that one-year contract, like I  
17 said, we do have a number of people that have already submitted their business applications —  
18 not applications, but they have submitted resumes or their paperwork just to explain who they  
19 are. And we would be deciding on what the criteria are that we would want them to meet and  
20 what the requirements are.

21  
22 Mr. Paul Brunner: Chuck, one point I need to emphasize. If you do come to participate,  
23 maybe not right at the beginning of the meeting, but through the course of the meeting, if you are  
24 going participate, there’s a need for you to sign a disclosure or a source selection form that says  
25 you will not disclose information about the competition. There’s a need that the information — if  
26 we start talking about the selection criteria and how we do things, it is not for public edification,  
27 to go out and to share with everyone to have on there. So it is not your normal meeting that we  
28

1 have for public participation during that time. But it is an opportunity for RAB members to come  
2 to participate, to see where it is. But if you do come, we will ask for that and we have to, to  
3 maintain the contracting process.

4  
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And the other thing that we have a possibility of doing is deciding  
6 on whether we want one contractor or two contractors working on the TAPP. Anyhow, if you  
7 want to see the Statement of Work, the draft form of it, what they're asking you to do is sign a  
8 disclosure statement over here. And you can read it over and see if you agree with it or not.  
9 What?

10  
11 Mr. Del Callaway: As RAB members we are entitled to see anything that happens in this  
12 meeting without signing anything. Without any sworn statements or anything. When we first  
13 started looking into the TAPP, we had decided that we were not going for a — what was, it a  
14 10-year?

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Five-year.

17  
18 Mr. Del Callaway: Five-year contract. We were going to do it on an individual basis with the  
19 \$2,500.

20  
21 Mr. Paul Brunner: Group hasn't decided that.

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes, the group hasn't decided anything.

24  
25 Mr. Del Callaway: We discussed it.

26  
27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: We discussed it, yes.  
28

1 Mr. Del Callaway: We discussed it. We didn't make any decisions to sign any statements for  
2 keeping things secret. There are no secrets among us.

3  
4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Right.

5  
6 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay, the contracting office, if we go with the \$2,500 or \$25,000 whatever  
7 it is, it doesn't involve the contracting office. We don't need to go through the contracting office.  
8 So therefore, we don't need that statement. We do not have to go through the contracting office.

9  
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: Del, if you make a \$2,500 buy below that — the dollar amount is \$2,500.

11  
12 Mr. Del Callaway: \$2,500 or below.

13  
14 Mr. Paul Brunner: The contracting office makes the buy. Contracting has to be involved with  
15 the government procurement of that.

16  
17 Mr. Del Callaway: But we do not have to have a statement. I've already checked into it. I've  
18 read the Federal Register. I've gone through it page by page, paragraph by paragraph. I discussed  
19 it with Chuck. This was going to be tabled until you held that meeting. We were going to discuss  
20 it at that meeting among the RAB members.

21  
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That is correct.

23  
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: All we're sharing here is that as we go through it...

25  
26 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, don't be telling these RAB members that they need to sign a  
27 swearing statement that they're not going to divulge any information. We already have it in our  
28

1 Charter. We have our Charter and it specifically says in there what we can do and what we can't  
2 do. And we're not go to play these games with you.

3  
4 Mr. Paul Brunner: Del, it's not for discussion.

5  
6 Mr. Del Callaway: Listen. I've dealt with you before and I know all about you and your  
7 practices on contracting out. We're not going to play your game. We don't want to go that way.  
8 We don't want to go that way

9  
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: It's not a game.

11  
12 Mr. Del Callaway: We're going to do it on a \$2,500 level.

13  
14 Mr. Paul Brunner: Del, you're not the Technical Review team. The team has to meet to make  
15 that decision. That's what Chuck just talked about and there's other people on the RAB that have  
16 input on that and the team needs to meet to make comment.

17  
18 Mr. Del Callaway: I understand all of that. But they have to understand that they do not have  
19 to sign that. That statement that you're asking them to sign. Now, if you have gone out and asked  
20 people to a statement, I surely hope that only one person would sign it and that would have been  
21 Chuck.

22  
23 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think you're off base.

24  
25 Mr. Del Callaway: No, I'm not off base.

26  
27 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think you are. Let's move on.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, we did discuss regarding that we would prefer one-year  
2 contracts so that we could basically choose those that have come into us, rather than going out  
3 and advertising. But that can be discussed.  
4

5 Mr. Del Callaway: Every RAB member sat there and nodded their heads, yes, they were in  
6 agreement.  
7

8 Mr. Paul Brunner: The only order that that applies to, is not a one-year contract. It's a one-  
9 time delivery order that's less than \$2,500. If you wanted to do each, and you have to look at the  
10 reports that we have, that you review with, and if the scope of the effort is less than \$2,500, then  
11 you can go forward and the source selection is much simpler. So it's not a one-year contract on  
12 that. If that one delivery order for \$2,500 was a year's time then that's okay. But if you go with a  
13 one-year contract that's out for competition where we're open for competition and that, then we  
14 would go through the contracting process and that's really all I'm saying.  
15

16 Mr. Del Callaway: If we go with the \$2,500 contract or less.  
17

18 Mr. Paul Brunner: There would be multiple contracts that way.  
19

20 Mr. Del Callaway: We'll have multiple contracts and the RAB members will make the  
21 decision on who the contracts go to and not your contracting office. And any RAB member that  
22 sits here and agrees with you — your contracting office making the decision, they're not looking  
23 out for their community.  
24

25 Mr. Paul Brunner: So far, Del, what we've talked about on the decision on that, is that we  
26 have an opportunity where the government would work with the RAB. The RAB would make the  
27 choice — there's criteria that the contractor have to follow that's in the Federal Code. They have  
28



1 to meet certain criteria. We've gone through that many times.

2  
3 Mr. Del Callaway: I've read your Federal Register and I didn't see one thing in there about a  
4 Federal Code for the contractor. Would you quote that page?

5  
6 Mr. Paul Brunner: Then you need to go back and read it again because...

7  
8 Mr. Del Callaway: Do you have that page handy?

9  
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: Did you attend the meeting the other night? I think Doris went through it  
11 very well, if you ask me.

12  
13 Mr. Del Callaway: If you have that page I'd certainly go back and read it. If I've over-looked  
14 something...

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, that's why basically, Paul, we've called the next meeting so  
17 that this can be discussed in full detail.

18  
19 Mr. Del Callaway: My advice to all the other RAB members is not to sign any statement  
20 swearing that you'll keep anything secret because you have no secrets from the public. You are  
21 community members. If the Air Force wants to dictate who you're going to hire to read your  
22 manuals to go back to the Air Force to tell them what you want in your write-ups.

23  
24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Cleanups.

25  
26 Mr. Del Callaway: Then you don't need anybody.

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: Del, it's not a secret, it's a contracting process. If the people come back  
2 out here in this meeting, this gentleman here just presented, and we give him an unfair advantage  
3 as to what the Scope of Work is, that biases the competition. It's not a secret.  
4

5 Mr. Del Callaway: We are not giving him an unfair advantage. But we don't want you hiring  
6 him to look at papers that we're going to agree on that he's going to be looking out for our  
7 interest. Because he's not. He's going to be looking out for yours.  
8

9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, I have the one question here Paul, for the people to get this  
10 draft Statement of Work. I take it you still want them to sign the Disclosure Statement, right?  
11

12 Mr. Paul Brunner: I would say yes. And when the meeting starts off as we start the process, if  
13 the group decides that that's all they want to do is less than the \$2,500 buys and we do multiple  
14 ones each time when it comes up, then that does give a different picture as to what the group has  
15 talked about so far, and potentially the Disclosure Statement, I'd have to work through that.  
16

17 But so far, as we went through that, we haven't talked about doing that specifically. And I didn't  
18 attend that meeting as to where we were. When you guys decided that, I didn't get...  
19

20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No, no. There was no decision at the meeting because there was  
21 only three people there at the meeting.  
22

23 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay.  
24

25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And we did discuss that somewhat, okay? Not in great detail, but  
26 we did go into it.  
27  
28

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: If you end up doing that, each individual buy, that means that every time  
2 something comes up, we'll have to stop and work through the process of making that happen for  
3 you. Versus having something on line to work...

4  
5 Mr. Del Callaway: That's not true. That's not true. You can have them in advance. You can  
6 have the people lined up in advance. You can have all five of the people picked out and ready to  
7 go. All you have to do is lay the paperwork in their hand and sign it.

8  
9 Mr. Paul Brunner: You have to do a process, Del.

10  
11 Mr. Del Callaway: You're talking about leading the people around in the blind. You don't  
12 have to do it your way.

13  
14 Mr. Paul Brunner: Del, you have to go through a contracting process. Are you a contracting  
15 officer, Del?

16  
17 Mr. Del Callaway: No, I'm not, but...

18  
19 Mr. Paul Brunner: Then you can't even speak to it.

20  
21 Mr. Del Callaway: I have a question for Chuck. Who's running your meeting? You or Paul?

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, it doesn't matter because that's why we're having the  
24 meeting on the...

25  
26 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, you're sitting there asking him what he wants to do at your meeting,  
27 that you are telling us that we're going to attend.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No. No, I didn't say that. You didn't listen. I said...

2  
3 Mr. Del Callaway: I was listening, man.

4  
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, then listen again.

6  
7 Mr. Del Callaway: I will.

8  
9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I'm talking about what he would do, okay? As far as this draft  
10 Statement of Work that Sheila and I have, whether or not, in order to issue this draft Statement of  
11 Work, if another RAB member wants to have one here at the table, then they would have to sign  
12 this Disclosure Form. Now what I'm about to say is this. If somebody wants the draft Statement  
13 of Work, Paul just told me if you want to get one you can pick it up from them. But you're going  
14 to have to sign the Disclosure Statement, because they're not going to give you a copy of it,  
15 unless he changes his mind because he just said that. Okay?

16  
17 Mr. Del Callaway: Why would they want it if they don't need it? If we're going to do it under  
18 the \$2,500 or less, why would they want it because they don't need it?

19  
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: Because you haven't decided that yet.

21  
22 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, we haven't had the meeting yet.

23  
24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, that's fine.

25  
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well why don't we table the discussion until after the meeting?

1 Mr. Del Callaway: So that's why I'm making this point to tell these people that they don't  
2 have to sign that and they don't have to go that route.

3  
4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I just want it because they might be able to glean some  
5 information. Not necessarily how we're going to do the contracting, but they might be able to  
6 glean some information out of the Statement of Work. Now if they don't want it and, they don't  
7 want to sign a Disclosure Statement, that's fine with me. I'm just telling them that its available  
8 and they can get them for Merianne or Roxanne. But in order to get this draft Statement of Work,  
9 this thing that may not come to be, then they should see Roxanne or Merianne and sign a  
10 disclosure statement if they want to after the meeting. Otherwise, just forget it.

11  
12 Mr. Del Callaway: I think you should be advising them to forget it, until you hold your  
13 meeting. After you hold your meeting and all the discussion is done, then if they want to do it  
14 then, it would be appropriate. I wouldn't be encouraging anybody to sign anything in agreement  
15 with Paul Brunner.

16  
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No, I...

18  
19 Mr. Paul Brunner: Del, there is no reason to show anxiety there. Within the realm for the  
20 meeting is — if you come to the meeting, I think my comment was — I didn't ask for people to  
21 sign the thing tonight. There's no reason to sign tonight.

22  
23 Mr. Del Callaway: You shouldn't have asked them to sign it to start with, because Chuck is  
24 the Chairman of the meeting and he should have been running the meeting.

25  
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: Del, don't go there. Okay? You're just making waves on it and where we  
27 are. We're both Chairs.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No, what I meant was, if somebody wants one of these Statements  
2 of Work, did they need to sign the Disclosure Statement? Because somebody might be sitting  
3 here that wants one. I'm not recommending...

4  
5 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Are you going to give it to them, if they don't sign it?

6  
7 Mr. Paul Brunner: No.

8  
9 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's why I signed it, because I wanted it. I wanted to see it.

10  
11 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think that was pretty clear...

12  
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So if you want to see one or if you want one after the meeting or  
14 during the break, just go over to Roxanne or Merianne and sign this Disclosure Statement. But if  
15 you don't want to, that's fine, too. I'm not promoting it either way.

16  
17 Mr. Del Callaway: Well then, quit encouraging them to go over there and pick it up. Ladies  
18 and gentlemen, don't go over there and pick it up. Leave it alone.

19  
20 Ms. Merianne Briggs: I need to make a correction to the record. Only I would have the  
21 Statement of Work. Roxanne is not, since she's a contractor, would not see that.

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, okay. Sorry about that. So Merianne only.

24  
25 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Also, if you're interested at that meeting on February 11<sup>th</sup>, we will  
26 have probably Ralph Munch there from contracting and we will be able to answer these questions  
27 and you'll have time to discuss, share your ideas on that. We're meeting 6:30 to 8:30 here and I  
28

1 wanted to make a point to let you people know that it is in Room 3. We've never had a meeting  
2 as far as I know in Room 3 before, so...

3  
4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So now I take it it's time for our break, right?

5  
6 **RAB Advisory Worksheet Report**

7  
8 Mr. Paul Brunner: No, we have the RAB worksheet.

9  
10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: RAB worksheet.

11  
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: And we have public comment period, too.

13  
14 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh yeah, that's true.

15  
16 Mr. Paul Brunner: Real quick on the RAB worksheet. There's one worksheet out for the RAB  
17 to work on and that is on the *Community Relations Plan*. That was provided and it was given to  
18 all the various RAB members. And we did get back comments at least from Sheila. You provided  
19 comments back to us on the plan.

20  
21 Ms. Sheila Guerra: On what now?

22  
23 Mr. Paul Brunner: On the *Community Relations Plan*.

24  
25 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Yeah, I did to Merianne, but I wanted to comment on that also to the rest  
26 of the CR people that they all got copies of the draft and they need to give Merianne some input.  
27 And hopefully before the next CR meeting.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Can you tell them the date they have to have the comments in by?

2  
3 Ms. Merianne Briggs: I would like to have that input as soon as possible. I was hoping to  
4 get some tonight from that.

5  
6 Ms. Sheila Guerra: When is the deadline on the draft comments?

7  
8 Ms. Merianne Briggs: It was actually yesterday. The next review cycle that is coming up  
9 will be 16 February through 19 March and that would be on the Draft Final.

10  
11 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay.

12  
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So if they had some comments regarding the *Community Relations*  
14 *Plan*, if they had it in by Friday, it would be early enough?

15  
16 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Yes, we'll work with that.

17  
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. Thank you.

19  
20 **PUBLIC COMMENT AND QUESTIONS**

21  
22 Mr. Paul Brunner: Let's go to public comment time.

23  
24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Public comment time.

25  
26 Mr. Frank Miller: Frank Miller. Question regarding the TAPP program. I have a question for  
27 the gentleman who presented from Acton Mickelson. You mentioned that you have, you now  
28



1 have, or you have had prior military contracts or Air Force contracts? Isn't that what you stated?

2  
3 Mr. Michael Acton: We have done <indiscernible>.

4  
5 Mr. Frank Miller: You have done work from the Air Force before? And I take it that you  
6 would like future work from them, from the Air Force. Right? That's a yes? Well, I think that  
7 that clearly constitutes an unacceptable conflict of interest, right at that point.

8  
9 Mr. Paul Brunner: Anything else, Frank.

10  
11 Mr. Frank Miller: Regarding, I believe Roxanne said that she's on duty for 40 hours a week.

12  
13 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: That is correct.

14  
15 Mr.. Frank Miller: Right? So that means that you are costing us 40 times 60, is \$2,400 a  
16 week. That's \$10,800 a month. That's \$129,600 a year. I rest my case on that one.

17  
18 Mr. Paul Brunner: What case are you resting?

19  
20 Mr. Frank Miller: Well, the point is that this base is at the bottom of the ninth inning. And  
21 we taxpayers would like to see some economies of scale here. You know, for one thing, you have  
22 two positions: a Director of Environmental Management; and then you've got another position,  
23 the Chief of Installation Restoration Program.

24  
25 At the bottom of the ninth inning, these two jobs can be folded into one job and let's save the  
26 taxpayers some money. I mean, a \$90,000 Ride Share coordinator, a \$129,600 secretarial work. I  
27 mean, where do you get the nerve to present the taxpayer with that kind of a bill?

1 Moreover, at the beginning of this meeting, you stated here that none of the people here are  
2 responsible for any of the pollution here. You know, in 1975, when you started here, there was  
3 illegal dumping going into Pit Number 4. I have a letter from the Base Commander, Colonel  
4 Campfield, in 1981 that said that dumping was going into Pit 4 in 1981. Now that means,  
5 Mr. Brunner, that your hands are a bit dirty.

6  
7 Mr. Paul Brunner: Not really, Frank.

8  
9 Mr. Frank Miller: You're not clearly, not responsible.

10  
11 Mr. Paul Brunner: I was an employee on the base at the time.

12  
13 Mr. Frank Miller: You have a lot of nerve to stand in front of a statement like that and  
14 present that to the public. You are responsible to an extent.

15  
16 Mr. Paul Brunner: Are you done?

17  
18 Mr. Del Callaway: Is that one of those things "what does 'is' mean"?

19  
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: No, not at all. I mean, I came to the base first as an environmental engineer  
21 in 1975. Start working at the base, I pointed out to the Base Commander that they had something  
22 going on out there. I never went there. You're the bio on the case of the health issues for at least  
23 four years on base and you didn't do anything.

24  
25 Mr. Frank Miller: You mean you pointed out to the Base Commander that there was  
26 something illegal going on there?

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: In 1975, I went to the Base Commander and the CE types at that time and  
2 asked why.

3  
4 Mr. Del Callaway: Frank, he just told us that no one in this room was working out there when  
5 that happened.

6  
7 Mr. Frank Miller: Can you stand here in front of a statement like that and try and come off to  
8 us, try and come off to us like you're Mr. Clean, like you're Mr. Clean?

9  
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: We've had the three minutes here, Frank.

11  
12 Mr. Del Callaway: No. He gets 10, 10 minutes.

13  
14 Mr. Frank Miller: You're not Mr. Clean here.

15  
16 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Also, I'd like to clarify the record, as far as the money that's on the  
17 contract for the specialist, that does included 10 public ads. And, also, the position is not a  
18 secretarial position, it is a public relations — Public Affairs Specialist.

19  
20 Mr. Frank Miller: Okay, I'm glad you brought that point out because at contracts over  
21 \$25,000 you're supposed to put that out for competitive bid. And in this case, Mr. Brunner did  
22 not. He just added that contract onto an existing Radian contract.

23  
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: Actually Frank, you're inaccurate. Under the contract that was  
25 competitively awarded. We have delivery orders that we can place the orders against. And a line  
26 item that was in the contract, that allowed us to exercise that. So in this case, we already  
27 competitively bid that before and we can do that.

1 It happens all the time. It's totally legal as to where we are and it was out there in the CBD. We  
2 went through the process, and we accomplished that. We are past the three minutes. Any other  
3 public members? Gary?

4  
5 Mr. Gary Collier: Gary Collier again. I'd like to get some questions answered. I'm not too  
6 familiar about the TAPP as far as the logistics involved in this. I'm not sure on the contracting,  
7 why we're not looking at an educational institution rather than a contractor, if the idea is to be  
8 able to decipher what this information is, and understand the context of it in looking at, is this the  
9 best available technology.

10  
11 I think that we should be looking at some higher levels — higher universities, such as University  
12 of California and/or Livermore Laboratories. And see, "Hey, is there a better available  
13 technology"? They're working on a lot of stuff up at Livermore that I'd like to bring to the RAB  
14 in a future committee, that we really need to be looking at. What is the future technology coming  
15 along? I don't think that a contractor, that is only aware of what is currently there, and wanting to  
16 essentially maintain that.

17  
18 It's not going to have necessarily the emphasis to look at the possibilities out there. Perhaps  
19 there's a cheaper, more effective means of cleaning it that's on the horizon that we need to be  
20 looking at, before we invest or even continue something that is not as effective and is in fact  
21 polluting the air in our surroundings. Can you address that, Mr. Brunner, as far as is that a  
22 possibility in the TAPP process now? Instead of — I'm very troubled what I have heard through  
23 the grapevine that there were projections that they were going to have a large contract. Being that  
24 it is an "X" amount of dollars and that's it for the lifetime of this RAB.

25  
26 I think we need to go slow here and use small amounts and have total control in the RAB to  
27 make sure that we're getting what we want as an education.

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think the aspect of using educational areas may have very good merit.

2 One has to find a way to have the relationship built and most likely that's a contractual  
3 relationship sometime. And we would have to work that. If we choose to do that, we could work  
4 to make that happen. The small order buy has merits like you're talking about, if that's what we  
5 choose to do with it. We just haven't reached that point. I think it potentially could happen.

6  
7 Mr. Gary Collier: Has that, educational institution, been considered to this point?

8  
9 Mr. Paul Brunner: I don't think so. I'm not aware unless you guys talked about it the other  
10 day.

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The University of Maryland over here submitted a packet on the  
13 TAPP. I didn't read it thoroughly. That will be available on our meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> of February.

14  
15 Mr. Gary Collier: Okay. Also, I'm unclear whether this is going to be pertinent or not. But  
16 regarding percolates...

17  
18 Mr. Paul Brunner: Perchlorates.

19  
20 Mr. Gary Collier: Perchlorates. I'm sorry I'm still ramping up on some of these  
21 terminologies. I don't know that RAB has been made aware that the EPA is having a meeting in  
22 San Bernardino next month regarding that issue. Has that been brought to the RAB's attention?

23  
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: I don't think we have. McClellan so far has not had a perchlorates issue.  
25 Perchlorate has been more of an AeroJet/Mather issue. I know Alex might be more familiar with  
26 that than we are.

1 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: That's time for this period.

2  
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Any more comments?

4  
5 Mr. Del Callaway: It appears the audience member, not even being a RAB member at this  
6 time, a prospective one though, seems to be in line with what I was saying a while ago about  
7 smaller bites and spread the money out over a longer period of time with more participation by  
8 other people. That way we are not necessarily sticking with one person or one firm. We can have  
9 four or five different firms spread over a longer period of time.

10  
11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: We'll discuss this on the 11<sup>th</sup> thoroughly. Any other comments?

12  
13 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I have one comment just before we go to break. Where is Randy Adams?  
14 How come he is not attending our RAB meetings anymore?

15  
16 Mr. Del Callaway: Oh, I can address that. Randy Adams doesn't like our meetings. And at the  
17 BCT meeting, he and Linda Hogg made a statement that they — she thought our minutes were  
18 obnoxious, atrocious, and a few other good things. In fact, they don't even want them mailed to  
19 them. So that's probably why he's not here.

20  
21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I think they're having someone in their office being mailed a copy.  
22 I don't remember the name of the person.

23  
24 Ms. Sheila Guerra: But why isn't he here? Does anyone know?

25  
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think from the interface that they have with the State, unless Alex, you  
27 want to address it from the State's point. From my feedback is that historically in some of our  
28

1 RAB meetings they have not necessarily been really productive from their point of view to come  
2 forth. And as we worked through the meetings in that, I think we have improved a lot, we have  
3 new members coming on in that.

4  
5 Ms. Sheila Guerra: But our statement of when we began forming a RAB, they were part of  
6 this RAB. And now they just nonchalantly exit? They haven't even talked to us. Nonetheless,  
7 they haven't even sent their representative for the Community Relations Committee. I have not  
8 seen him either. Because he doesn't have time? I don't find that an excuse.

9  
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: Sheila, from my point of view, is because you have discussed that with  
11 me. I have taken that message back to the State Cal/EPA portion, DTSC, Department of Toxic,  
12 and to let them know that there's interest as to why they're not here. And to please attend and  
13 that.

14  
15 I think internally now as they work through it, they do have state representatives. In this case,  
16 they probably will defer to Alex to provide the input from the Regional Water Quality Control  
17 Board. Probably the better to go through is we just address that issue directly back to them,  
18 perhaps some correspondence from the RAB to the DTSC might work well to ask why.

19  
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: By the way, as far as the regulators, Joe Healy and Alex  
21 MacDonald, please do, if you're at our meetings, give us your opinions. Your likes and dislikes.  
22 Your advice. And let's hope to improve them.

23  
24 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's part of our two-way communication with EPA and Cal/EPA and all  
25 the other agencies. So, I mean, we are at the table and we expect everyone else to continue to  
26 participate. And at least let us know what's going on, why they're not here.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, we're going to go on a break right now for five minutes until  
2 about 22 after. Then we'll go into the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency and County Well  
3 Proposal.

4  
5 **Break**

6  
7 **Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA)**

8  
9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency. They have a presentation  
10 that they would like to give to us. Grant Kreinberg is here tonight to do so. Yes. If you don't  
11 mind, go right ahead Grant. Appreciate having you.

12  
13 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Hi. Good evening. My name is Grant Kreinberg and I represent  
14 Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency or SAFCA. And I want to talk to you tonight about a  
15 project that we are working on just west of here, Magpie Creek. And specifically or generally  
16 what I want to focus on tonight is we've heard community concern that there may be hazardous  
17 waste that is in Magpie Creek and what we're doing to address those issues.

18  
19 But just let me describe it real quickly. North, I'll use this map. North, at the top, is Raley  
20 Boulevard. Here is Magpie Creek. Can everybody see at this point where things are? Here's  
21 Magpie Creek coming off the base. Here is Don Julio Creek. They join just west of Raley  
22 Boulevard. Historic Magpie heads southwest. Back in the 1950s, the Corps of Engineers and the  
23 State of California got together and they created the Magpie Creek diversion channel, which  
24 takes it over here to Robla Creek area.

25  
26 As I mentioned it was constructed in the early 1950s — with — it has been flooding. There's  
27 been a problem with flooding, particularly around Raley Boulevard. It seems to flood a couple of  
28



1 times every year, in the couple of years that I've seen it. The Corps has gone through and  
2 analyzed it in a study that was released about a year ago, determined that the channel capacity is  
3 insufficient at this point, and is proposing to widen the channel. Right now it's got a bottom  
4 width of about 25 feet. The proposal the Corps has is to widen it to 65 feet. They looked at a  
5 number of alternatives in doing that analysis, and that's the one the Corps has come down to at  
6 this point.

7  
8 Anyway, during some of the public hearings that were held out there, there were concerns raised  
9 that there may be hazardous waste or contaminated soils out in that area resulting from activities  
10 on McClellan Air Force Base. I have Pam Wee from Kleinfelder, an associate, a geotech firm  
11 that works with SAFCA. We've compiled the available information on what testing has been  
12 done out there. We've done some. The Corps of Engineers have done some. There's been a  
13 number of different investigations. Just like to summarize it for folks as to what we've been  
14 doing out there and what we've found so far. So Pam, if I could.

15  
16 Ms. Pam Wee: Okay, this is just a map of the area and it shows the sampling that we've  
17 done out there. In 1966, we went out and took samples in the creek as well as some borings  
18 alongside in the pocket area. If you look on the map. You have a pen there, Grant, to point to...

19  
20 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Sure. I was going to say let's orient folks as to where they are. Here  
21 is Raley Boulevard in here. Here is the base boundary shown by this line is Magpie Creek  
22 coming off through the base off the base. Don Julio Creek. Magpie diversion channel.

23  
24 Ms. Pam Wee: So the first thing we did was, within the channel, there was 10 locations  
25 that we took samples. You can see them designated here. This S-1, so on, 1, 2, 3, all the way up  
26 here through 10. Those samples were taken right up the soil water interface, the top layer of soil.  
27 We dug down between 1 to 2 feet to the hardpan in the creek and took samples down there.

1 Unknown: Did you say 1966?

2  
3 Ms. Pam Wee: I'm sorry, 96, not 66. I was too young then. What happened with those  
4 samples, we just go into a little bit. The 10 locations at the water interface, the depth of 1 to 2  
5 feet, and the way we selected the locations, were areas where either the channels change direction  
6 where there were activities going on out there, such that there could have been potential  
7 hazardous waste downstream, even though we didn't necessarily see anything in particular.  
8 Those samples were analyzed for metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, both diesels and gasoline,  
9 organochlorine pesticides, oil and grease, and both aromatic and volatile organic compounds.

10  
11 And this is what was found. There was some diesel fuel hydrocarbons at levels between 13 and  
12 64 milligrams per kilogram. A little oil and grease up to 1,400 milligrams per kilogram. The  
13 metals concentrations were all at regional background levels. There was one location at sample  
14 local S-7, I'll show you that in a minute, where chromium was just slightly elevated. Everything  
15 else was not detected. All the hydrocarbons and oil and grease were real consistent with what's  
16 seen in urban runoff.

17  
18 Ms. Chris Quakenbush: Can we ask questions along the way, or...?

19  
20 Ms. Pam Wee: Sure.

21  
22 Ms. Chris Quakenbush: What standard do you normally apply? Do you normally use urban  
23 runoff as your standard?

24  
25 Ms. Pam Wee: No. I'm just saying what you would expect in sampling after rainfall  
26 around urban areas. You'll always see oil and grease because of automobiles and that type of  
27 thing. So you will see it around. The location where that was seen is this S-7 over here and yet  
28

1 nothing was seen in this area closer to the Air Force Base.

2  
3 There were some activities going on up here, maybe junkyard, old autos, and so on and so forth.  
4 So it's entirely possible there's a little storm drainage ditch coming down here, that something is  
5 running off at some point during the rainfall into that creek. But that's all that was really seen.  
6

7 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: The comments that Pam made about the results are consistent with  
8 urban runoff. What we're trying to do is put it into perspective. It's not what you would find — it  
9 is not a result you would expect to find in a Sierra stream. In an urbanized area, what I'm  
10 understanding is the results are pretty consistent with what you would find.  
11

12 Ms. Pam Wee: Yes, yes..  
13

14 Ms. Chris Quakenbush: Is it hazardous though?  
15

16 Ms. Pam Wee: No it is not hazardous.  
17

18 Ms. Chris Quakenbush: And how do you determine that? What is the scale that you're  
19 comparing to for hazardous waste?  
20

21 Ms. Pam Wee: Well, the kind of thing that was seen...  
22

23 Mr. Paul Brunner: Probably the best person — you guys are doing it from flood control  
24 responses and that, I would recommend that maybe Alex should actually respond to that, because  
25 he's the regulatory agency that would be reviewing as to what the controls are. That would be my  
26 suggestion.  
27  
28

1 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Could I just ask one thing so we can have this all on the record? If you  
2 have a question, come up here so that it gets into the tape. Thanks.

3  
4 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Sure, when I look at that data, I agree the data that I've seen in  
5 other streams in the sediment samples in the Sacramento area, those are not out of line. The  
6 concentration TPH is nothing we would take action on to go after nor the oil and grease. The  
7 only other thing they had in there was chrome, and I don't know what the highest chrome  
8 concentration was, but, you know, if metal are background concentrations, we don't require a  
9 cleanup to background concentrations. I mean, we don't require you to go after those  
10 concentrations.

11  
12 The only thing I didn't see any results for pesticides. Were they not detected?

13  
14 Ms. Pam Wee: There were none. We did not find any. No.

15  
16 Mr. Alex MacDonald: None, okay. If you're looking at hazardous concentrations, the only  
17 number out there that we have a hazardous concentration for is TPH, and that's at 1,000  
18 milligrams per kilogram. And that's basically based on ignitability of material, not as for looking  
19 at ingestion or exposure to human beings. So none of those concentrations that I saw would be  
20 hazardous.

21  
22 Ms. Chris Quakenbush: One more question. I'm Chris Quakenbush, for the record. The  
23 question that I ask is that we're planning to more than triple the flow of water along this water  
24 shed. And I'm wondering whether your current findings are going to be consistent with what we  
25 will find when we triple the water flow through McClellan. I don't know if you've been able to  
26 calculate whether there will be a change in the toxicity based on the increase of water flowing  
27 through that area.

1 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Let me try and restate, if I could, the question if I understand it.

2 The flood flows coming off McClellan are the question, or the groundwater treatment affluent?

3  
4 Ms. Chris Quakenbush: The waters are going to be tripled along the Magpie Creek corridor  
5 going to the north. They used to go to down to south. Now they're going to go to the north. It is  
6 going to go by my property and my children and I'm concerned about the increase in the water  
7 carrying more toxicity off the base than it used to.

8  
9 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Okay, and I'm not hesitating in trying to think of an answer, but  
10 how best to express it. The volume of water that will be coming off the base, the volume will not  
11 change that significantly over time. As there is more organization on the base there will be some  
12 additional runoff, but essentially the volume of water will not be changed significantly. What will  
13 be changing as we widen this channel is the rate at which that water flows through the channel.  
14 By widening the channel, we're still taking the same volume through. We're just able to take it  
15 through at a quicker rate.

16  
17 Ms. Chris Quakenbush: No, you're redirecting the channel. The channel is being redirected  
18 and when you triple the water flows at a high water level...

19  
20 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Okay.

21  
22 Ms. Chris Quakenbush: The northern channel, the diversion channel will now  
23 accommodate three times as much water.

24  
25 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: The channel as I mentioned, the diversion channel, was constructed  
26 in the 1950s. Since that point or since that time there hasn't been any record of significant flows  
27 going down Historic Magpie Creek, this direction. Now we haven't had, there is a levee right at  
28

1 this point, we haven't had a levee break, we've been very close at times, because the project  
2 needs to be constructed. But we have not had water heading in the southwest direction. There is  
3 an inadequate capacity in this channel as the water has been ponding up on the base here and just  
4 west of the base, between the base and Raley. What we will be able to do by widening this  
5 channel is reduce the flooding out in here and take this volume of water which stands out here, if  
6 you will, during wet weather and convey it through, convey it out.

7  
8 Ms. Linda Piercy: Excuse me. Linda Piercy here. That sounds like more water will be  
9 moving on the diversion, Magpie Creek diversion. If it's standing still, I mean you just got  
10 through saying that there won't be any more water coming down there.

11  
12 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: The volume of water will not be increased. Now it stands out here.  
13 In other words, there is, say, a gallon of water standing, 10 gallons of water standing out here for  
14 example, just to put it in perspective. And we're able to, the channel right now can take a gallon  
15 a day. So it takes 10 days to drain it. By enlarging the channel, we can carry, say, 3 gallons a day.  
16 So we can cut the time. We're not increasing the amount of water. We still have the same 10  
17 gallons going down. We're just being able to excavate it or allow it to move through quicker.

18  
19 Ms. Linda Piercy: So what you're doing is you're going to get rid of excess water on Raley  
20 Boulevard. Is that what we're doing here?

21  
22 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Yes, one of the goals is to dry up Raley Boulevard so it doesn't  
23 flood. The water that floods Raley Boulevard, right by the paint factory, our goal is to make — to  
24 do away with that problem. Paul?

25  
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: This is Paul Brunner. As a point of clarification, correct me if I'm wrong,  
27 maybe the total volume of water would be the same over time, because so much rainfall falls. But  
28

1 could you address — is the peak amount of water at any given time going to change, because of  
2 the proposed change? And one particular area the volume overall over time may be the same  
3 because so much rain falls and it's going to move through. But on a peak on a given time, will  
4 the peak change? Will the peak flow be higher?

5  
6 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: The peak flow will change.

7  
8 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think that's what your question was.

9  
10 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: In volume over — in a period of time. So, yes, the amount of  
11 water, the total amount of water will not increase. The amount of water moving through in a  
12 given period of time will be increased. The total volume of water is still, say, the 10 gallons. That  
13 does not increase. We can just take it through quicker.

14  
15 Ms. Linda Piercy: Sounds like a play on words.

16  
17 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Okay. Anyway, what I'd like to do is get back to, you know, the  
18 HRAW, or the hazardous waste investigation that we've been doing out there because that's  
19 really the focus of what we came for tonight. Pam?

20  
21 Ms. Pam Wee: Okay. In addition to those sediment samples in the streams, we took some  
22 soil borings alongside. Let me show you where those were. Again, these were in 1966, there were  
23 three borings.

24  
25 Unknown Male: 1996.

26  
27 Ms. Pam Wee: I can't believe I can't get over that 96. Just ignore my 66. B-1 here, B-2,  
28

1 and B-3. Those are the three boring locations that were taken in 1996.

2  
3 Okay, the samples from those borings were collected at different depths 5, 10, and 15 feet below  
4 the surface. The same analyses were done on these samples as were done on the sediments  
5 samples. And we didn't find anything except the usual background levels of metals in soil. That's  
6 it.

7  
8 And then in 1998, recently, the Corps was out doing some work in that area and we took  
9 advantage of that situation to go out and take a few more borings. So these — the dark black dots  
10 are the locations of the borings that were taken in November of 1998.

11  
12 Ms. Sheila Guerra: So are you testing every two years, is that where you're going...

13  
14 Ms. Pam Wee: Not necessarily. It happened that we did. But it wasn't necessarily  
15 planned that way. We were just taking advantage of a situation.

16  
17 Ms. Sheila Guerra: You don't have a regular basis to do the samples?

18  
19 Ms. Pam Wee: There's not a regular sampling schedule or anything like that. The borings  
20 that were taken along the south bank, there was those four that I told you. The depths ranged  
21 from anywhere from 15 feet down to as deep as 30 feet. We were trying to get a spectrum of  
22 depths.

23  
24 Okay, in this case, we analyzed for the petroleum hydrocarbons, VOCs, and the BTEX, benzene,  
25 toluene, and zylene compounds, which would be associated with gasoline, oil and grease and  
26 metals. In this case, we didn't find anything, we didn't find the oil and grease — nothing.



1 Ms. Linda Piercy: Linda Piercy here. Have you ever seen Magpie Creek diversion? Have you  
2 seen the water there personally?

3  
4 Ms. Pam Wee: I have been out there, yes.

5  
6 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: A number of times, yes.

7  
8 Ms. Linda Piercy: And you didn't find anything? It's right off my property. It's filthy.

9  
10 Ms. Pam Wee: Oh, yes. It looked — the time I was out there it looked dirty that we found  
11 some — there was debris in the creek — you know, pieces of metal, old boat, etc. There were  
12 things in the creek. And it can be dirty, you can smell organic kind of smelly things like bacteria  
13 in the water, in the sediment and stuff. But, those are kind of — the organic or the bacteria smell  
14 can be kind of a natural anaerobic kind of smell. But we didn't see the hazardous chemicals. I  
15 guess in the testing, and that's what we were looking for the hazardous chemicals.

16  
17 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Erwin Hayer. The old Magpie Creek downstream of where the current  
18 diversion is. Has that ever been tested for contaminants?

19  
20 Ms. Pam Wee: I don't know. Grant, do you?

21  
22 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: I don't know.

23  
24 Mr. Erwin Hayer: All the runoff from McClellan Air Force Base during the period of time  
25 that contaminants were being dumped on the ground, ran down the old Magpie Creek until the  
26 diversion was put in. And the diversion was put in sometime in the middle '50s.

1 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: True.

2  
3 Mr. Erwin Hayer: And after that, nothing went down Magpie Creek from McClellan Air  
4 Force Base.

5  
6 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: True.

7  
8 Mr. Erwin Hayer: From the old channel.

9  
10 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Right.

11  
12 Mr. Erwin Hayer: All the contaminants in the '40s and early '50s that went down there. Is  
13 any of that still there or is that all gone?

14  
15 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: I don't know. We have been looking at this from the perspective of  
16 flood control improvements. We're not, and this is the piece that Mr. Hayer is talking about,  
17 we're not looking at doing anything down there to disturb any materials. Again, we were looking  
18 at it from the perspective of flood control. We want to improve the channel. Is there anything in  
19 the channel? Is there any hazardous waste in the channel at this point? And, as Pam had  
20 mentioned, we had also checked slightly off the channel in the bank, because that would be the  
21 area that we would be excavating. We wanted to make sure that we didn't find anything,  
22 excavate and find a pocket of material in there. And we weren't finding anything. Since we're  
23 not proposing to do anything down here, we did not look at that.

24  
25 Mr. Erwin Hayer: On the flood control portion of it, you're going to dry up the area east of  
26 Raley Boulevard and flood the area north of Robla Creek on the east side of the bike trail?

1 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: I can handle the first part of that. No. We're — right now we're  
2 potentially looking at not drying this up.

3  
4 Mr. Erwin Hayer: If you increase the size of that channel across there, from a 25-foot-wide  
5 bottom to a 65-foot-wide bottom, that's going to move a lot more water.

6  
7 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: It will move it once you get to Raley. But what we're looking, and  
8 we're fine-tuning the design right now, is that these channels in here don't have capacity. You  
9 will still have really sheer flow across that land. We're working with that. If we dry this up, this  
10 property up, the Fish and Wildlife Services have gone through their analysis and said there's a lot  
11 of vernal pools out there. You have extensive mitigation.

12  
13 We have had discussion with one of the property owners in that, since there are vernal pools that  
14 have been identified out there, that property does not have a lot of value at this point. If someone  
15 went in there to build a warehouse, they'd have to mitigate it also. So maybe the best thing to do  
16 is to use that as a mitigation site, as a possibility. That's one of the discussions that we're having.

17  
18 Mr. Del Callaway: Aren't they filling in and building out there now?

19  
20 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: I think it's closer. When I drove in tonight, I think it's closer in this  
21 area right now.

22  
23 Mr. Del Callaway: Up a little bit more.

24  
25 **<Indiscernible discussion>**

26  
27 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: One west of Raley and east of Raley.

1 <Indiscernible discussion>

2  
3 Mr. Del Callaway: Real close to Magpie.

4  
5 <Indiscernible discussion>

6  
7 Mr. Erwin Hayer: They raised the footing area about 3 to 4 feet.

8  
9 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Okay, I thought that was south of Magpie.

10  
11 Mr. Erwin Hayer: That is south of Magpie. The water used to get into that area from Magpie.  
12 So they raised the floor level of the building up high enough that it would be above water.

13  
14 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Okay. I haven't been out except for driving through it tonight and it  
15 was dark.

16  
17 Mr. Del Callaway: If you look at your S-1, it would be just about where that S-1 is. But what  
18 is that little road down below the S-1?

19  
20 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: I think that's a paper road. Honestly, I don't think, it's a plotted  
21 road. I don't think it's a road that's on the ground.

22  
23 Mr. Del Callaway: What's that one that's right at the top?

24  
25 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Same thing.

26  
27 Mr. Del Callaway: Just above Don Julio Creek, that road that has the little round circle right  
28

1 there?

2  
3 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: This?

4  
5 Mr. Del Callaway: Yes.

6  
7 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Again, I think that when this was developed, they used what's been  
8 plotted as streets, but isn't necessarily paved.

9  
10 Mr. Erwin Hayer: It was graded through there, but it was only paved back to where that circle  
11 is.

12  
13 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Yeah, yeah.

14  
15 Unknown Male: I would like to ask a question.

16  
17 Mr. Del Callaway: I haven't seen that out there. That's why I looking at that.

18  
19 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: It's not on the ground. Legally, there's probably a road there. But  
20 there's nothing there on the ground to indicate that it is a road.

21  
22 Unknown Female: It might be a feature that you can see on the aerial photographs.

23  
24 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: It could be.

25  
26 Mr. Gary Collier: You alluded that the purpose of this is so that Raley Boulevard can be an  
27 all-weather road. We all know living here in the community, how we can't get down that road on  
28

1 a regular basis. But instead of flooding the people downstream, which we don't want to see  
2 happen, because they're really in a terrible situation. Where they're getting all sorts of people  
3 flooding them from different directions and then saying, "But we'll even buy flood insurance."  
4 But now the federal government's turning around and saying, "If you file for flood insurance,  
5 we're only going to give it to one time."

6  
7 So that's really not a good compromise. What I would like to see happen on Raley Boulevard is  
8 utilize materials to build the road up, but allow sufficient space larger than what's there, so that it  
9 doesn't necessarily back up with culverts. Build the road up and don't allow development in the  
10 floodplain. This project that you're talking about will do one thing: it will make it easier for City  
11 of Sacramento to come into the vernal pools and utilize it for what they want to do, get income  
12 tax increment funding coming through. It is one purpose for this project and that is to allow  
13 further development. The EPA, the Fish and Wildlife Service, they're all taking a back seat on  
14 this, including the Army of Corps Engineers. They are allowing those developments to go in,  
15 wiping out vernal pools. The vernal pools don't just stop at McClellan Air Force Base. They're  
16 outside the base, too.

17  
18 Mr. Grant Kreinberg:           Agreed.

19  
20 Mr. Gary Collier:       And we're not having public hearings on how these vernal pools are  
21 disappearing. We write documents. I've written to the City many times on these parcels and said,  
22 "Hey, we have a vernal pool issue here." "Oh, no. We don't have a vernal pool issue here." They  
23 don't know what vernal pools are unless you take a picture of them. That's just the way it is with  
24 the City.

25  
26 Also I'd like to find out about, I haven't heard one bit about radionuclides. Did you test for  
27 radionuclides?

1 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: No we did not. My understanding is that that was not something  
2 that we should be looking for out here. And that's a good comment. Is there a problem with  
3 radionuclides?

4  
5 Mr. Gary Collier: On base there is and they had to go somewhere. They went down Magpie  
6 Creek. If they got into the creek channel, then the decaying plant materials would have absorbed  
7 it into the creek banks when they decomposed through the roots.

8  
9 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: To give you a bit of information, it's a very good comment. One of  
10 the things we're finding, is that the sediment in the creek is somewhat sandy. The creek banks,  
11 the bottom, and the sides are very fine-grain hardpan material that doesn't absorb very much at  
12 all. And not very much grows. In fact, yes, there's a lot of plant material on the bottom of the  
13 channel right now and it's more of a issue with maintenance. But when you clean that out, very  
14 little starts to grow in the side of that channel. It's really hard-grain soil. But it's a very good  
15 point. Yes.

16  
17 Mr. Gary Collier: Am I clear you're talking about widening the channel? Are you talking  
18 about providing levees on an area that doesn't have levees now? And who's going to pay for  
19 that? Because what we're doing is subsidizing developers that shouldn't be developing on this  
20 land in the first place.

21  
22 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Okay. Let me take it again — it's a multi-part question. What we  
23 are looking at doing is widening the channel, not raising the water level in it. So that would need  
24 levees. By widening the channel, we would have to look to finance it. SAFCA is the only vehicle  
25 for financing assessment districts. It would take a Proposition 218 election to pass this.

26  
27 Mr. Gary Collier: And would that be limited to the local community?  
28

1 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: It would be limited. The people that the Corps has identified that  
2 benefit from improving this, are these people in, say, the blue, say, the red area, let's use the red  
3 area. So those people would have to approve this probably through a Prop 218 election. The  
4 details haven't been worked on exactly. We're still working on the concepts of what's the best  
5 way to work this.

6  
7 Ms. Chris Quackenbush: There are assessment districts, but the State has a share and federal  
8 has a share in the flood portion. And as a matter of fact, there was \$12 million recently allotted  
9 from the State that hopefully has stopped for this year. Your tax dollars and mine that are going  
10 to these kinds of projects, in addition to the assessment district. So this is not simply an  
11 assessment district. This comes out of our tax dollars.

12  
13 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: True.

14  
15 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Erwin Hayer. I have a document here put out by the Corps of Engineers as  
16 a final detail *Environmental Impact Report for Magpie Creek*, dated April 1996. In this, it shows  
17 on a 50-year flood, that the water flow down Raley Boulevard on the Magpie Diversion Creek is  
18 1,100 cubic feet per second. Now, down the old Magpie Creek at the same time it's 1,200 cubic  
19 feet per second.

20  
21 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: That assumes, what that is, is the assumption that if there is a  
22 failure, it goes down here.

23  
24 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Well, it shows 2,300 cubic feet per second at Raley Boulevard, on a 50-  
25 year flood.

26  
27 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: True. Okay.



1 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Okay, that 2,300 cubic feet per second has to go somewhere. The diversion  
2 channel is capable, maximum of 1,100. If I go to another document here, it's got 950, 850 cubic  
3 feet per second. But I'm going to say 1,100 cubic feet per second. That's 1,200 cubic feet per  
4 second now that will be going down the old Magpie Creek. The paragraph ahead of that.

5  
6 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: If we don't approve it. If we don't do something.

7  
8 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Agreed. If you don't do anything. It will cause the levee to breach, when  
9 the levee breaches, some of that 1,100 cubic feet per second is going to be added to the 1,200  
10 going down that stream on a 50-year flood.

11  
12 Now my question is, how big of a flood, year-wise, percentage-wise, whatever, have we had  
13 there that water has been near the top of the levee? That levee hasn't been breached as far as I  
14 know, since it's been built. I walked that levee two years ago from one end to the other looking  
15 for a spillway. There was no spillway.

16  
17 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: True. I think we probably got to last winter, probably 70- or 80-  
18 year storm. We did not breach that levee.

19  
20 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Then this document is in error, saying a 50-year would put more water.

21  
22 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: No, in other words, the Corps uses a statistical approach in doing  
23 this. And they're saying, that, you know, likely it would break. The fact that it didn't last year  
24 doesn't mean that it won't next year. Statistically, it doesn't have the reliability and safety that  
25 the Corps would like. It's a matter of statistics on that.

26  
27 Unknown Female: **<Inaudible>**  
28

1 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Since a lot of this does not have levees on it, they don't need to, the  
2 risk and uncertainty is assumed to be — the failure point is assumed to be the top. So where  
3 you're inside channel, you're at the top. In this area there is somewhat of a levee section that's in  
4 there. They use risk and uncertainty and I don't recall where the probable failure point was  
5 assumed to be. I can find it in there, I just don't recall what it is. But, predominately, there's not  
6 much risk and uncertainty in this because it's our inside channel.

7  
8 Mr. Erwin Hayer: My family has property over there, just where Magpie Creek Diversion  
9 intersects Robla Creek, and we've had it since 1942. We didn't have any flooding problems there  
10 on the south end by Robla Creek until Magpie Creek was put in there. We built the Rio Linda  
11 Airport there and after the airport was built and Magpie Creek was put in, we got over 3 feet of  
12 water on the runway.

13  
14 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Diversion channel.

15  
16 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Right. Now we've raised the runway 6 feet at the south end to get it out of  
17 the water. Right now we have the possibility with present conditions, putting water on the  
18 runway again without the increase in Magpie Creek. If this is increased and the water gets down  
19 there quicker, we're going to have deeper water there.

20  
21 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Since you've got the Corps reports, there's quite a bit of hydraulic  
22 analysis in there. It shows that the peaks on these creeks do not occur concurrently. So you're not  
23 going to get an additive condition, is the way the Corps has gone through it. They do not come up  
24 with an additive condition. Where the water coming down Robla, Magpie is then added to it.  
25 Magpie peaks. Robla comes in I think about 6 or 7 hours later.

26  
27 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Oh no, no. Robla and Magpie peak at the same time. They're basically the  
28

1 same watershed from...

2  
3 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: As I understand it, Magpie is a much smaller watershed.

4  
5 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Robla, I believe, is smaller than Magpie. You're talking Dry Creek. Dry  
6 Creek comes all the way from Newcastle and Robla Creek comes from North Highlands.

7  
8 Mr. Paul Devereaux: That's right.

9  
10 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Okay. I've been honest, the reason — Paul's here, too, is that I've  
11 been focusing on Magpie and not as much on Robla Creek. So I'm not into the specifics and the  
12 details of Robla Creek.

13  
14 Mr. Erwin Hayer: What I see with the enlargement there, is we'll have water flowing  
15 upstream in Robla Creek where it intersects, probably clear back up to 26<sup>th</sup> Street back to  
16 McClellan again.

17  
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: One thing we're going to have to do is hurry up and draw a  
19 conclusion, because we have another speaker right after this. We don't want to be on this all  
20 night. Gerry Blauth has been standing up here.

21  
22 Mr. Blauth: Yes, I asked a group. Am I too loud? I yielded because I didn't want to go ahead  
23 and interrupt and I apologize because we're talking here about the flooding problem and that all  
24 goes together. I do for the <indiscernible> group has actually a different question. And that is,  
25 the widening of the channel and the work that is included with it, will it destroy more Elderberry  
26 bushes or beetles? And how will it affect actually because, since we have the Endangered Species  
27 Act, that's actually what we go by. What really happens to the species? We figure is, what  
28

1 actually will happen to us and how will they be affected?

2  
3 And so any contamination in the Magpie Creek area, it is obviously interesting to me to find out  
4 what effect it will have on the wildlife and especially the endangered species. And if there was  
5 any study made or if there's any study plan for it? And I don't know if you're aware of it, too,  
6 that there was other things planned — that things were supposed to be done on McClellan that  
7 also would go ahead and increase the flood problem. And of course, I know that I put a few  
8 questions together, but I wondered if a study was made for it or if it is in the works?

9  
10 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Let me kind of take it in pieces, then. In regards to the Endangered  
11 Species Act, there has been, I would say, a considerable amount of study done along the whole  
12 Magpie Creek area to identify areas of endangered species.

13  
14 Mr. Blauth: And how it will affect when you are finished.

15  
16 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Yes. In other words, to begin with where is it right now. Where we  
17 have areas of endangered species, and then what we have been doing with this is actually laying  
18 out these improvements to avoid those. To me, the less expensive mitigation is avoid an impact  
19 in the first place.

20  
21 Mr. Blauth: Will we be entitled to see the study and to find out?

22  
23 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: It's in the documents that Mr. Hayer has. I can get you more  
24 copies.

25  
26 Mr. Blauth: Well, the last part I had on the Magpie Creek was from 1995. Is there a newer one  
27 out now?

1 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: No, there is not. There has not been a newer...

2  
3 Mr. Blauth: So, therefore, you see, we cannot be talking about the effects that your work  
4 actually will have. Because at the time that wasn't even planned, was it?

5  
6 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Yes, in other words, the documents that Mr. Hayer has, address and  
7 lay out the program that we're moving forward with the same channel.

8  
9 Mr. Blauth: Oh, I see.

10  
11 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: So the survey work has been done in there and I don't know  
12 whether you have the complete set of them.

13  
14 Mr. Erwin Hayer: I got three more books.

15  
16 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Okay.

17  
18 Mr. Blauth: Does it address the endangered species as well?

19  
20 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Yes, there's quite a bit of information on there. I don't know if  
21 there's been correlation done between the effect on endangered species and contamination  
22 coming off McClellan.

23  
24 Mr. Blauth: And the building that is planned for certain portions of McClellan, I believe was  
25 not included in there either, because, for instance, the EVOC was only discussed, I believe a  
26 couple of years ago, because an application was only filed in May 1997.

1 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: True, true.

2  
3 Mr. Blauth: So that will be interesting to see how all these things work together. Because that  
4 obviously is what we would have to live with.

5  
6 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: True.

7  
8 Mr. Blauth: Thank you.

9  
10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Could you stick that last slide you had on there. I'm sorry but I  
11 have three questions, real short questions. One thing about funding. I saw an article in the  
12 *Sacramento Bee* that said that funding was being made available by Congress for a number of the  
13 creeks to improve them around Sacramento. One of them was Magpie Creek and all they said in  
14 that article was an unspecified amount of money for Magpie Creek.

15  
16 I'll ask three questions real fast. That was one of them. Did you get any money and how much if  
17 you know? The other thing is where is, the eastern side of the improvement that you're talking  
18 about? It looks like that that is on the west side of Raley. Last time I saw it was on the east side  
19 of Raley.

20  
21 The other thing is just a note of information. Kelly Moore Paint Store there, they had a, I guess it  
22 was a flood control pond or basin that was in back of their store. And they put a sign out and that  
23 was so — their requirement to build because they're in a flood zone there. To get the permit to  
24 build they had to have that flood control pond or basement out there because they're between Old  
25 Magpie Creek and the Diversion Channel there. I brought it to Rob Kerth's attention that they put  
26 a sign out in front of their store asking for fill to — clean fill like concrete and everything. And  
27 so they took that thing and they filled it all up and leveled it off and that control basin isn't there

1 any more and I'm wondering how they're getting away with it, since that was the requirement to  
2 build the store in the first place.

3  
4 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: If I can answer it in three parts and if I miss one. The Corps has set  
5 — I'll say set money aside for this project. This is included in what's called Section 205  
6 Continuing Authorities Project. In those kinds of projects, the Corps lumps a number of these  
7 together across the country and gets, say \$50 million allocated to go build these. It does not take  
8 separate congressional authorization. The Corps — in those Section 205 projects have, I believe  
9 it's a \$5 million federal cap on it at this point. So they've allocated money to this project. Right  
10 now we're doing some design studies. Very little of that money has been spent, so it's kind of  
11 programmed for this in probably 2000. 2001 is when we will be looking at constructing it. So it's  
12 on the list as a project. But it's not a separately-authorized project by congress. I missed the  
13 second. Let's go back to the second question.

14  
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Where's the end on the east side of the creek?

16  
17 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: What we're looking at right now is probably — not probably,  
18 going about 75 to 100 feet east of Raley Boulevard because of hydraulic conditions. Just  
19 basically to get a hydraulic entrance condition out there so we can handle it and that's as far as  
20 we're going.

21  
22 The third part of it, you are correct. And let me use Pam's figure again. Kelly Moore is shown  
23 right here. When this diversion channel was constructed there was a bypass facility put in where  
24 water could be released from Magpie Diversion down to start Historic Magpie. It crossed Kelly  
25 Moore property. That area has been filled in. No question. That was a City, if you will, that was a  
26 City decision or it was allowed to occur through the City of Sacramento. SAFCA is a regional  
27 Flood Control District. The City is one of the parent agencies. But SAFCA does not get into land  
28

1 use.

2  
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: But I understand that was filled in illegally the way I understand it.  
4 They didn't have any permits or anything from the City to do it, that I know of.

5  
6 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: You may be right. I know that right now that diversion structure  
7 doesn't go anywhere and that area where it probably used to go is filled in. I totally agree with  
8 you. It would be up to the City to take action against Kelly Moore.

9  
10 Unknown Male: Can probably identify through the City.

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Identify the fact, I did through Rob Kerth, but I don't know  
13 whatever happened to it.

14  
15 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: I think you've gone to the right source with it.

16  
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, could you bring it up to them again, so that they know that  
18 that's exactly what happened?

19  
20 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: They are well aware of it.

21  
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, they're well aware that it was filled in. Did they approve of  
23 that being done?

24  
25 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: I don't know the steps on it. I don't know the steps on it.

26  
27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Maybe after the meeting you could tell me a contact person that  
28



1 could tell me whether that was approved or not, or call me up, whatever.

2  
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think we're getting — one last question.

4  
5 Ms. Chris Quackenbush: Thank you. That's what I was going to say. You probably need to  
6 end this to go on with your other subjects. But I think there's a great deal of public interest in this  
7 particular project. I heard you allude earlier to public hearings. I was never notified about this at  
8 all. My property abuts the area and we are definitely concerned. We are influenced by the flood  
9 waters that will be produced by it. And I object mightily to the fact that I was never notified in  
10 any way, shape, or form that this project was taking place. And I think that we should hold public  
11 hearings on this particular, "improvement," moving water from one community to another. And I  
12 think that we need to hear, as a community, a plan for those public hearings so that we can go  
13 forward knowing what is going on and make sure we have our input.

14  
15 Mr. Grant Kreinberg: Okay, good point. I can tell you the sponsor of the public hearings  
16 was the Corps of Engineers. And I'm going to guess it was two-and-a-half years ago when they  
17 did it. The Corps was responsible for contacting folks at that point. I do know they had it. I was  
18 in attendance at that meeting. I don't remember the details as to the notification or whatever it  
19 was, two-and-a-half years ago. Obviously, they did not contact you.

20  
21 Mr. Del Callaway: Nobody was contacted.

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thank you very much for coming.

24  
25 Mr. Paul Brunner: We can tell that there's definitely lots of interest in the flood. It's raining  
26 outside, or at least it was recently. A couple of points while we're transitioning here real quick, I  
27 know, Gary, you had mentioned about. Is Gary Collier still here? Oh there you are. We do have  
28

1 some data on Magpie Creek, and Erwin, you had mentioned that, too. There's not a whole bunch  
2 but we did do some data sampling many years ago when ATSDR, Agents for Toxic Substance,  
3 came in, and we worked them in the community years ago.

4  
5 Unknown Male: On the old creek?

6  
7 Mr. Paul Brunner: So there is some data, not a whole bunch, but there is some. That's part of  
8 the communication we'll work with you on.

9  
10 While we're also transitioning, let me quickly say on the West Area update, on the creek itself,  
11 the Air Force is proceeding with its plans to restore the area, restore the creeks as close to the  
12 natural condition that we have, working to put it back to where it was in that area. We have  
13 talked to Grant and that about how and what their plans are.

14  
15 Internally, we're proceeding that the restoration area has priority, that we restore the area. We  
16 preserve various areas based upon the perusal that we need to go through in the area and we'll do  
17 that. If somehow we can accommodate their plans, we'll do that. But our first priority is to  
18 restore the area. And you'll see those plans, we are still on target towards the end of the month  
19 coming forward with the Environmental Assessment and also the Restoration Plan that we're  
20 working towards. With that I think we go to the next comment.

## 21 22 **County Well Proposed Ordinance Update**

23  
24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. The next one is we have a special guest here, Steve  
25 Kalvelage. It's regarding the County Well Proposed Ordinance Update. And he's going to give us  
26 an update on this. He talked to us at the last RAB meeting we had and here he is once again.

1 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Thank you. I'm Steve Kalvelage. I'm with Sacramento County  
2 Environmental Management Department. The last time I was here we talked about a proposed  
3 change that we're making for the Sacramento County Well Ordinance relative to issuing well  
4 permits, letting people drill wells. This was brief history on that. This was something that was  
5 brought forward from us from staff, from Regional Board, and DTSC concerning sites in  
6 Sacramento County that have known contaminant plumes. The original discussion that we had  
7 was taking the best-known knowledge of those contaminant plumes and going down 2,000 feet  
8 and putting in what we're determining the concentration area, where before a well permit is  
9 issued there would be a <indiscernible> with the State's staff as to what the uses of the well  
10 would be, what's appropriate for it, those types of things.

11  
12 At the meeting last month a strong concern was expressed by this group to not remove the  
13 exclusion area that has been around McClellan for a number of years. And we had intended to  
14 substitute this 2,000-foot perimeter for that exclusion area. Given the input that we received, and  
15 we've received further comment from the State also, we're leaving that intact in the code. It was  
16 in a code section, County Code Section 6.29, that was exclusive to that, saying this is all that  
17 section talks about. We're rolling the pertinent sections of that into County Code Section 6.28  
18 along with this 2,000-foot zone.

19  
20 So that's more or less my update. That seem to be the major concern in the issue for this group. I  
21 think this will be a benefit in other areas of the County that haven't benefited from an exclusion  
22 zone. We're now going to be looking at all the wells that are going in and how they are going to  
23 affect contaminant plumes. I don't want to rattle on too long. That was my update. Does anybody  
24 got any questions?

25  
26 Ms. Sheila Guerra: When are you going to update us again on this?

1 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: I'm not planning on updating you guys regularly.

2  
3 Mr. Sheila Guerra: When will we hear about it next?

4  
5 Mr. Steve Kavelage: We're having a workshop, February 17<sup>th</sup>. I would be happy to put  
6 anybody on the mailing list that's interested, and/or you can call and just leave me your name and  
7 your mailing address and I'll make sure that we mail you the notice. It hasn't gone out yet.  
8 February 17<sup>th</sup> at 6:30.

9  
10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: How about giving your phone number.

11  
12 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Phone number at my office is 875-8463. That goes right to my desk  
13 or my voicemail. So if you can't catch me at the desk, just state that you want to be involved in  
14 the Well Ordinance Workshop February 17<sup>th</sup> and give me your name and address.

15  
16 Unknown Male: What was that number again?

17  
18 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: The number is 875-8463.

19  
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: You'll also find that — I know we sent a letter to you very recently that  
21 would support your conclusion. We asked you not to change it.

22  
23 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Correct. That was the feedback and we got no feedback other than  
24 that. The ordinance has been in place for a number of years. There's no reason not to leave it in  
25 place if there's an expressed concern from the people in the area. If we hear otherwise that'll  
26 have to be dealt with at the workshop. But so far we haven't heard any other comments on that.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: What about the 2,000 feet out from the other areas around the  
2 base? Does that still hold even though you're going to do it on the west side?

3  
4 Mr. Paul Brunner: He's talking about the east side of the base.

5  
6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The east side, the north side.

7  
8 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Correct, yes. That's the proposal. It would be, it would be — you  
9 see the map over there of the area, the west side is the only area where there's exclusion zones  
10 now. What we're proposing would be a perimeter on the entire circumference.

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, that's what I thought. Then you haven't modified that any?

13  
14 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: No. That's intact.

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, thank you. That helped me.

17  
18 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Thank you.

19  
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I appreciate very much for you coming and staying through all this.  
21 Thank you very much.

22  
23 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Thank you.

24  
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And thank you very much for taking our concerns.

26  
27 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: You're welcome.

## 1    **IRP AND WEST AREA UPDATE**

2  
3    Mr. Paul Brunner:     Okay, and I think that brings us up to the IRP update and the west area,  
4    Elaine.

5  
6    Mr. Del Callaway:     Can you talk fast, Elaine?

7  
8    Ms. Elaine Anderegg:     Good evening. My name is Elaine Anderegg. I'm going to give you  
9    an update on the IRP Program. Go to the next slide. We're going to talk about some of the  
10   documents coming out, the field activities that we had over the last quarter, some of the decisions  
11   we've been focusing on in our meetings with the regulatory agencies. Then last thing is the West  
12   Area update.

13  
14   In our field activities, we do have a standard set of operations going on. The groundwater  
15   treatment plant is up and running. The SVE operations are happening. There's quarterly OU B-1  
16   program happening. We talked about some of the checking we did this last quarter on the SVE  
17   systems.

18  
19   We're continuing to make progress on the Industrial Wastewater Line inspections. That's those  
20   laterals, those areas coming from the buildings to the main trunk lines. Jerry talked a couple of  
21   meetings ago in a little more detail on that project. One of the good news there is there's a lot of  
22   integrity in those laterals and we continue to see that's the case as we complete this work.

23  
24   Fuel line inspections are going on. These are some of the areas where we have abandoned lines  
25   and we're trying to locate those all and take those out or grout them in place as we close the base.  
26   The *Groundwater IROD* that we had, the *Interim Record of Decision*, we're in the Phase II  
27   construction there. That includes additional extraction monitoring wells going in, as well as some  
28

1 modifications to the treatment plant. We're doing really well there. We've got about 35 of the 86  
2 wells. Those wells are both monitoring and extraction wells proposed to go in, about 30% of the  
3 way done on that.

4  
5 In our investigations we had significant field activity that started up late fall and has continued  
6 into now. And we're about 84% done with that activity that we had scheduled for this year. Real  
7 good success there, too. Continuing even through the mission requirements because some of the  
8 sampling was in buildings. I mean we've managed to work around mission requirements and still  
9 keep that all on schedule.

10  
11 These same projects will be continuing on. We still have some more data in particular with the  
12 non-VOC contamination and our remedial investigation area. Continuing to put some more wells  
13 in, as we proceed ahead with the SVE actions that we have. We are continuing to put in systems  
14 in the next couple of years to clean up those soils and the groundwater.

15  
16 Some of the key documents that came out last quarter were the *VOC Feasibility Study*, which  
17 was out for RAB review, and it originally came out so you guys have seen that. The *Community*  
18 *Relations Plan* we talked about. The *Five-Year Review* also came out and that was one that we  
19 had given to the RAB to take a look at. That document talks about looking at those Interim  
20 Record of Decisions we have. Where do we stand today? How successful have they been? Do we  
21 need to take any additional actions? And the one thing we're seeing coming out of that is on the  
22 OU B-1, which was the PCB cap at DRMO, there was some recommendations in the ROD that  
23 we need to do a little more follow-up to complete those tasks, but otherwise, we've been very  
24 successful in getting those Interim Record of Decision in place up, and running, and functioning.

25  
26 The *BRAC Cleanup Plan* came out this last quarter as well as several SVE proceedings. These  
27 same documents you see going into the next stage over the next quarter. The *Five-Year* will go  
28

1 final. *Community Relations Plan* by our next meeting should be final, as well as the *BRAC*  
2 *Cleanup Plan*. We will continue over the next couple of years to see the SVE actions come out.  
3 There will be a point at which we will talk about them in here for public comment as well.

4  
5 The key document that's currently scheduled to come out later this next quarter, is our *Non-VOC*  
6 *Feasibility Study*. Like the VOC which proposed cleanup methods and alternatives for the VOCs  
7 in the soils and groundwater, this is going to be looking at those non-VOCs: the metals,  
8 pesticides, PCBs, radiation. Ways that those soils can be cleaned up. It will be the initiation of  
9 that effort where we have a Record of Decision currently scheduled for early calendar year 2001  
10 right now on those.

11  
12 Our focus continues to be in the meetings with the regulatory agencies on the issues of that  
13 groundwater and soils cleanup levels for VOCs. We talked a little bit earlier about that, some  
14 input from you all tonight with Alex's proposal. And we'll still be working on that, as well as  
15 cleanup levels for shallow concentrations for VOCs has been another topic where we're looking  
16 at, is there a concentration there that drives a risk requiring cleanup and if that's different from  
17 what levels would require the groundwater. And we think those two blend very well together  
18 right now.

19  
20 On the West Area, I did talk about this at a couple of the last meetings, where the civil engineers  
21 were going to be out on the lined areas. That work has been completed for this year as far as any  
22 clearing of the drainages on base.

23  
24 Upcoming work, as Mr. Brunner just mentioned, is Creek Restoration. May not be quite ready by  
25 the next RAB, but around the next RAB. Right now our plans are that we would really be into  
26 that. The plan would have been out by then and we would be looking at taking the early part  
27 actions on that work.



1 In the Creek Week cleanup, I put it there again, probably the next RAB, right around there is  
2 usually when Creek Week is. So just some heads-up thinking about that by April. That's usually  
3 when that week is. I don't know exact dates right now but we will be having activities. We're  
4 looking to have a tour again on base of the vernal pools some time in the spring when it looks  
5 appropriate. And an opportunity to get out there. It is amazing how much stuff continues to come  
6 down the creeks in terms of, like laundry baskets, shopping carts, and things at time. So I think  
7 we'll have some good activity. Be a real good chance too, for any of you who haven't had an  
8 opportunity to go out there and see what we're talking about on that creek restoration work  
9 before we get into it. It would be a good opportunity to come out and actually walk it in a fun  
10 environment with everyone. So that's what we'll see coming up into the April timeframe. Any  
11 questions? Okay.

## 12 13 **OTHER BUSINESS**

### 14 15 **Defense Environmental Response Task Force (DERTF) Conference**

16  
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thanks, Elaine.

18  
19 Okay, the next topic is the Defense Environmental Response Task Force (DERTF) and also the  
20 Restoration Advisory Board National Caucus of RABs. The community members of RABs from  
21 all over the United States will be meeting in San Francisco. And it's going to be at the, where is  
22 that fort — Fort Mason in San Francisco. And so the RAB Caucus meeting is the last Saturday  
23 January 30<sup>th</sup> through February 1<sup>st</sup>, which is Saturday through Monday, and they have an agenda.  
24 If somebody wants this agenda I have an extra one here. I have an extra one at home, if someone  
25 gets this before you get to me. Also in here it has a schedule of the DERTF meeting. And if  
26 anybody plans on going to the DERTF meeting, Roxanne wanted me to say she has five folders  
27 of these with information concerning the DERTF. So you want to go over and grab one of them  
28

1 from her, if you plan on going.

2  
3 Like I said if you want this information regarding the RAB Caucus meeting over there in San  
4 Francisco, I don't know how many RABs will be coming this time. It's always an interesting  
5 time. They got the agenda and everything in here of what they're going to go over. Do you know  
6 if you're going to be having the van available or not, Paul?

7  
8 Mr. Paul Brunner: We will. What I had offered — I know I'll be commuting back and forth  
9 because I'm not going to be spending the night in San Francisco and hopefully the weather is  
10 good. But the commute back and forth, so I make the offer to the RAB members in attendance if  
11 they wanted to commute with me to go over and then come back and go back over and that. So  
12 I'll be doing that, depending on the interest, size of vehicle. Right now we've set aside an 8-  
13 passenger van that would be driven over. So if you plan on doing that, if you let me know —  
14 knowing that I'll get a smaller vehicle that's easier to drive than the 8-passenger van going back  
15 and forth.

16  
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So do you have any idea yet what time you'll be leaving?

18  
19 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, the first day is on the 2<sup>nd</sup>. The meeting starts at 12:30, so I figured  
20 that we would leave my area around 9:30. somewhere in that time period. It would give us time  
21 to get there, eat lunch if we wanted to, I'm not sure they have lunch at the beginning. But find out  
22 where we are, make sure we get there, and not just be rushing and settle in and go from there. So  
23 I was planning to leave like 9:30 the first day. Coming back, the session, the public session goes  
24 until 9. I personally don't really want to stay until 9 to commute back, so I would be looking to  
25 try to leave earlier and get back in the community sometime earlier. Maybe get back to the  
26 community in here around 9 or 9:30 or so. If people, if our RAB members wanted to give  
27 testimony and that then, we would work with you on that. There's two nights that that would  
28

1 occur, I believe, or two afternoons. Try to schedule early so that the people could make it up front  
2 so that they would be able to leave. But I know that coming back driving late at night, if I'm  
3 going to turn around and go back early the next morning, to get back there is difficult. Depending  
4 upon who goes I may ask some of the other folks to drive too. Like if you go with me as a  
5 government person, you can help drive the government van.

6  
7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, I would encourage, I wished the other two hadn't left, but  
8 maybe they can't make it anyhow. But I would encourage you to go, if you can make it — to the  
9 Caucus, a very interesting meeting. You get to meet people from different Restoration Advisory  
10 Boards from the east coast all the way up to Alaska, all the way down to Phoenix, Arizona. One  
11 lady came from Florida the last time. So I'd encourage you to go to the Caucus meeting if you  
12 can. You can attend one day if you want — Saturday, Sunday — read over the schedule —  
13 Monday — that's the Caucus.

14  
15 Now Tuesday, Wednesday are the DERTF meetings. I'd encourage you to at least go over there  
16 at least one day you know, Tuesday or Wednesday, and see what the DERTF is all about. I mean  
17 they're talking about base closing facilities and what the problems are there. And I just think it's  
18 really interesting. And I would encourage everyone to be available. You can go one day, two  
19 days, how many days you want to be. But now you're going to have free transportation here with  
20 Environmental Management, you know. And I would like to take advantage of it, for at least a  
21 couple of days. So I would suggest if you have any interest at all in going, maybe sign up, maybe  
22 Merianne, Roxanne over here can have a sign-up list and put your name and phone number on it  
23 so they can contact you later on. Of course they should have our full name and phone numbers.  
24 Gary, here's a chance for you, you know.

25  
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay, let's maybe go to the next one.

1 **Community Bulletin Board**

2  
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So, Community Bulletin Board. What do we have going?  
4

5 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Okay, everything. We have already covered things I was going to  
6 talk about like the passes. I just wanted be sure to let everyone know that we are going to have  
7 that training and the emergency Community Relations meeting on February 25<sup>th</sup> and that will be  
8 starting at 6:15 here at Vineland School. That's all.  
9

10 **Develop Next RAB Agenda**

11  
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. The next one is not necessarily developing the next RAB agenda  
13 because as we work through it, at the Chair Lunch we go through that. With the members that  
14 don't attend that from the RAB, is there any particular topic that you all think we should consider  
15 for the agenda next time?  
16

17 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I'm too tired to think right now.  
18

19 Mr. Paul Brunner: I know but not every — like Erwin, if there's a particular subject, you  
20 don't necessarily come to that lunch. Mannard, do you have any particular topic for the agenda  
21 that we should put on?  
22

23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The next RAB?  
24

25 Mr. Paul Brunner: For the next RAB.  
26

27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Do you have an agenda item for the next RAB meeting that you  
28

1 would like to see on there?

2  
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. We'll take the inputs and we'll build an agenda like we've done in  
4 the past. I think that then brings us to action items.

5  
6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Before we go into that, I would like to just mention something. We  
7 have an election coming up in April. So if you people have any nominations for who you would  
8 like to fill the seat that I'm in now as Community Co-Chair, please submit them to your  
9 nominating committee or your chairs: Sheila Guerra, Del Callaway, and myself. And so if you  
10 have any suggestions that you want for Community Co-Chair, now is your time. The election will  
11 be in April, at our April meeting, which I think is the 20 something of April, the 21<sup>st</sup> or  
12 something like that.

13 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay.

14  
15 **Recap Current Action Items**

16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay then, — the recap of the action items.

17  
18 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think, Roxanne do you have those?

19  
20 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Yes, I do. Chuck, for a point of clarification, is there a deadline when the  
21 folks have to get in their nominations to the Committee Chairs?

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, we have to have the nomination list wrapped up by the  
24 meeting in April. So I would think that probably by the March meeting we'd want to make the  
25 announcement of anyone, right? So I would say they would have to have them in by the March  
26 meeting, so that we can make an announcement regarding the Co-Chair.

27  
28 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Okay, thanks. For the action items, I have two. And that is — will repeat

1 again. Hold a special meeting of the Community Relations Committee on February 25<sup>th</sup> to  
2 discuss prospective RAB member, Gary Collier. That will be at 6:15.

3  
4 And the other one is appoint an Air Force point of contact for the Relative Risk Ranking portion  
5 of that committee. I believe that it was — did we want to determine that would be Elaine at this  
6 point or did we want to take that as an action item?

7  
8 Mr. Paul Brunner: For purposes of right now, yes. If we change, we change. But Elaine would  
9 be the point.

10  
11 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: So then at this time I only have the one action item as the Community  
12 Relations meeting.

13  
14 Mr. Paul Brunner: Did anyone have one that we may have missed — recorded? If not, I think  
15 we go to the closing remarks. Not closing remarks but public comments.

16  
17 **PUBLIC COMMENT AND QUESTIONS**

18  
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Public comments anyone?

20  
21 Mr. Erwin Hayer: I'm kind of new at this and all these acronyms that have been thrown  
22 around here, I've been lost on some of them. Could I ask if you can put all these on a single page  
23 of paper?

24  
25 Mr. Paul Brunner: A glossary?

26  
27 Mr. Erwin Hayer: A glossary or whatever. You know there's so many different ones.  
28

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: Hopefully a lot of them. I think Roxanne and Merianne are putting  
2 together a RAB binder for you as a new member as to where to come on. I'm pretty sure there's a  
3 glossary in there. Hopefully, it's inclusive.

4  
5 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Okay, thank you.

6  
7 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: There is one in the *Community Relations Plan*. And just for you at this  
8 time, what we can do is make a copy of that for you, so you can have a reference.

9  
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay if there's no — Chuck did you have anything else, or?

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No, I didn't have anything else, so we can go on.

13  
14 Mr. Paul Brunner: I guess motion to adjourn.

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Motion to adjourn. Does anyone second it?

17  
18 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I'll second it.

19  
20 Unknown Male: I second it.

21  
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: All in favor lift, your right hand.

23  
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: Thank you very much.